

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XVI, 2.

WHOLE NO. 62.

I.—THE IMPERFECT AND THE AORIST IN GREEK.

All students of Greek syntax are familiar, or should be familiar, with the great activity that has recently been displayed in the investigation of the use of the Greek tenses. Of the various publications on this subject that have appeared from time to time, there came to hand in 1892 a portion of a work by Fr. Hultsch¹ which, from the very start, by its scope and method of treatment, attracted a great deal of attention, and the completion of which was awaited with eager expectation. Now that the work has been completed and sufficient time has elapsed to dispel the first enthusiasm and to make room for calm and sober judgment, there seems to be the need of a somewhat elaborate review comprising a thorough criticism of the theoretical portions of the work and a summary of the most important details of Polybian tense-usage. The following paper is in the main an attempt to supply this want, at least partially; but it is only fair to state that it also partakes of the nature of an independent contribution by furnishing a certain amount of material derived from the writer's own investigations and observations.

In addition to a few prefatory remarks, Hultsch's work comprises 32 chapters, which may be divided into seven parts as follows: Part I (chapter I) contains the author's theory of the narrative tenses. Part II (chaps. II–IV) gives a conspectus of

¹ Die erzählenden Zeitformen bei Polybios. Ein Beitrag zur Syntax der gemeingriechischen Sprache von Friedrich Hultsch. Abhandl. d. K. S. Gesellsch. d. Wissensch., Band XIII, No. I, S. 1–210, u. IV, S. 347–468; Band XIV, No. I, S. 1–100. Leipzig, 1891–93.

the general use of the imperfect in Polybios. Part III (chaps. V-XXVII) treats of the imperfect and aorist with reference to certain classes of verbs. A chapter on the use of the imperfect and aorist in combination with adverbs of haste is inserted supplementary to the consideration of verbs signifying to make haste, and chaps. XV-XXVII are reserved for the discussion of such verbs as are especially important from the point of view of textual criticism. Part IV (chap. XXVIII) is devoted to the aorist exclusively. Part V (chaps. XXIX-XXX) treats of the change from the imperfect to the aorist, or *vice versa*, within the compass of a single period or in closely connected sentences. Part VI (chap. XXXI) disposes of the historical present, and Part VII concludes the entire work with a chapter (XXXII) on the pluperfect.

As for the introductory remarks, it was somewhat of a disappointment to find on p. 4 the statement that the investigation was not exhaustive, but was based on a collection of only between six and seven thousand examples. To be sure, Hultsch tells us that he has tried to omit no forms that seemed to be of any importance, that he has been unwilling to decide matters upon the basis of mere numbers, and that any considerable increase in the material would only have increased the difficulty of getting a comprehensive view of the whole; still, when one reflects that in the first five books of Polybios alone there are nearly 6000 examples of only¹ imperfect and aorist indicative; that what may appear uninteresting at one stage of an investigation may appear quite important at another; that while numbers may not be sufficient of themselves to determine a principle, they yet form a most important and sometimes absolutely indispensable element of investigation—when all this is borne in mind, one cannot always dispel an ominous foreboding that an exhaustive exhibit might possibly reveal essentially different results, and a contradiction like that mentioned below, p. 164, is certainly not calculated to allay one's distrust. Nevertheless, it is due our author to say that in more than one case he has really taken the pains to collect all the examples of a given usage, and that in many other instances the irresistible impression is made that absolute completeness, though not distinctly claimed, has for all that been aimed at.

The first chapter, as has been stated, treats of the general theory of the narrative tenses. Hultsch is to be congratulated

¹ Hultsch's collections are not confined to imperfect and aorist ind.

upon having quietly accorded to all the tenses used in the narration of past events, the right of bearing the name of *narrative*. Such a procedure does away with the perplexing question as to which tense is the narrative tense *par excellence*, and it is to be hoped that the statement in Kühner, Gr. Gr.², p. 135 (cf. Krüg., §53, 6), will be suitably modified in the forthcoming edition. But if we are doomed to face the problem anew, it would be well to bear in mind that possibly the imperfect possesses greater claims to that distinction than the aorist. Delbrück (Synt. Forsch. IV, p. 103) puts in a mild plea for the claims of the imperfect as "Tempus der Erzählung," but as it may be objected that he takes too narrow a view of the matter, and as the limitation he would impose upon the meaning of the word *Erzählung* certainly does not apply to our English word *narrative*, the question plainly resolves itself into one of numbers. Now, Koch has lately shown the overwhelming preponderance of the imperfect over the aorist in the first four books of Xenophon's *Anabasis*, and though he is inclined to overrate the value of Xenophon as evidence, and though his field of observation is dangerously small and the inferences drawn by him are not entirely correct,¹ it nevertheless remains a fact that the Greek is not at all shy of the use of the imperfect, and, for classic Greek, to judge from the figures given below, it would seem that the imperfect tense forms a larger constituent of historical narrative than does the aorist. These figures will also serve to correct any erroneous impression as to the universal preponderance of the imperfect that the reading of Koch's article may have produced, and though the figures speak for themselves, it might be worth while to point out specially that while Xenophon is so fond of the imperfect in the *Anabasis*, he is perfectly capable of indulging in an excess of aorist, as will appear from the fact that in the first book of the *Hellenica* the proportion of imperfects and aorists of the *Anabasis* is almost exactly reversed.

¹ Cf. Gildersleeve, A. J. P. XIV, p. 104 ff.

TABLE¹ SHOWING FREQUENCY OF IMPERFECT AND AORIST INDICATIVE IN HISTORICAL NARRATIVE.

	No. of Impf.	No. of Aorist.	Percent. of Impf.	Percent. of Aor.
Herodotos, Book VII,	819	588	58	42
" " (omitting ḷν),	729	588	55	45
" Book VIII,	587	399	60	40
" " (omitting ḷν),	516	399	56	44
Thucydides, Book VII,	593	372	61	39
" " (omitting ḷν),	518	372	58	42
" Total,	4286 ²	3910 ²	52	48
" " (omitting ḷν),	3685 ²	3910	49	51
Xenophon, Anab., Books I-IV,	1437 ³	880 ³	62	38
" " " (om. ḷν),	1148	880	57	43
" Kyr., Book I,	358	167	68	32
" " " (om. ἔφη),	260	167	61	39
" " " (om. ḷν and ἔφη),	241	167	59	41
" Book II,	282	176	62	38
" " " (om. ἔφη),	170	176	49	51
" " " (om. ḷν and ἔφη),	150	176	46	54
" Book III,	371	171	68	32
" " " (om. ἔφη),	249	171	59	41
" " " (om. ḷν and ἔφη),	232	171	58	42
" Hell., Book I,	186	317	37	63
" " " (om. ḷν),	163	317	34	66
Polybios, Book I,	572	618	48	52
" " " (om. ḷν),	492	618	44	56
" Book II,	308	491	39	61
" " " (om. ḷν),	254	491	34	66
" Book III,	652	647	50	50
" " " (om. ḷν),	569	647	47	53
" Book IV,	477	493	49	51
" " " (om. ḷν),	434	493	47	53
" Book V,	710	664	52	48
" " " (om. ḷν),	618	664	48	52
" Books I-V,	2719	2913	48	52
" " " (om. ḷν),	2367	2913	45	55
Arrianos, Anab., Book I,	332	374	47	53
" " " (om. introd.),	330	366	47	53
" " " (om. ḷν and introd.),	262	366	42	58

¹ Rigid accuracy is not claimed for the figures given in this table. They are the result of a single careful count. The amount of labor and time involved and the enormous tax on eyes and health rendered a recount impossible. Fortunately, however, absolute accuracy, though extremely desirable, was not absolutely necessary for our purposes. For even if we were to allow a tolerably large margin for error, the results would not be materially changed.—Pluperfect forms used as imperfects were excluded from the count.

² The figures for the whole of Thucydides were obtained by counting the imperfects and the aorists as given in v. Essen's Index Thuc.

³ These are the figures given by Koch, Jahrb. 146 (1892), p. 426.

But let us return to our examination of Hultsch. After all that has been said and written, the world over, by great and small on the subject of the tenses, the presentation of anything new regarding the theory of the tenses was hardly to be expected. As a matter of fact, Hultsch, on p. 5, openly accepts Curtius' formulae, and with him distinguishes between *Zeitstufe* and *Zeitart*. "With reference to the '*Zeitstufe*,'" says H., "the forms of the indicative belong to either the present or the past or the future; with reference to the '*Zeitart*', they are to be viewed as either '*dauernde*' or '*vollendete*' or, as Curtius puts it, '*eintretende*.'" Now Curtius, it must be admitted, rendered a signal service to the cause of Greek grammar by pointing out the true function of the augment and by instituting the distinction between the *sphere* of time and what he called the *kind*¹ of time (*Zeitstufe* and *Zeitart*), yet when that distinguished scholar adopted such terms as *dauernd* and *eintretend* as expressive of the fundamental distinction between the stem of the present and that of the aorist, and used all the influence of his authority in giving currency to his formulae, he placed in the way of the study of the Greek tenses a barrier that has not been entirely removed even at the present day. The term *dauernd* is utterly inadequate to express the various uses of the imperfect, and Krüger, to whom the term was no stranger, was evidently impressed with its inadequacy. But granting for the sake of argument that the term might be stretched so as to admit of that wider interpretation, it is reprehensible for being not simply ambiguous, but positively misleading. Otherwise, why all this warning² to the effect that the use of the imperfect is not dependent on the *absolute length of the time* of the action? Indeed, so deceptive is the term that not only scholars like O. Riemann have fallen victims to its snares, but some of the very men that have sounded the alarm, and among them Hultsch,³ have not at all times kept free from its meshes. It is therefore high time to abandon the formula, and if the notion of *Dauer* and *dauernd* must needs be retained, let it be retained

¹ Curtius, *Erläuterungen*⁸, p. 181, objects to Schoemann's term *Entwicklungsstadien* as being far too difficult for an ordinary school-grammar. It certainly is infinitely better than the term *Zeitart*. Brugmann in his Greek Grammar uses the term *Aktionsart*, which is quite an improvement upon Curtius' term.

² Cf. Gildersleeve, A. J. P. IV, p. 160; Curtius, *Erläut.*⁸, p. 181; Hultsch, p. 7.

³ See below, p. 145 and p. 146 f.

in its foreign form as a part of the scientific nomenclature. The term *durativ* in 'durative Formen' will do little, if any, harm, provided only it be understood that it is a convenient *name*, and nothing else.

As for the term *eintretend*, which has been done to death by Delbrück and has even passed into Latin syntax,¹ suffice it to say that when undefined it is so hopelessly ambiguous, and when defined so hopelessly vague or one-sided, that there is really no longer any excuse for its retention as a comprehensive definition of the aorist.² The difficulty, moreover, is greatly enhanced by the indiscriminate use of the past and the present participle (*eingetreten* and *eintretend*) and the substantive *Eintritt*, and to show that the reviewer is not simply indulging in 'hair-splitting,' he begs leave to call attention to the fact that *eintretend* has actually been confounded with *eingetreten* by Kaegi, who, after stating in §186, 3 of his Gr. Grammar, that in the case of the aorist indicative the augment refers "die Handlung *an sich* oder die *eintretende Handlung*" to the past, designates, in the tabular review of §186, 4, the 'Zeitart' of the present of inchoative verbs such as *γηράσκω*, as identical with that of the aorist. But *γηράσκω* is as much of a durative as any other present. *γηράσκω* is as a rule equivalent to *γέρω γίγνομαι*. The past of this is *γέρων ἐγίγνετο*, which is the imperfect that corresponds to the aorist *γέρων ἐγένετο*. Of course, the forms of the present may be aoristic in meaning, and so it may be conceived that *γηράσκω* might on occasion serve as an aorist, but that is not the natural and the regular use of the present of any verb, not to mention inchoatives like *γηράσκω*.

In spite of having accepted Curtius' theory of the tenses, Hultsch is not at heart satisfied with it. For on p. 6 he proceeds to define each of the narrative tenses, and when he comes to the imperfect and the aorist he proposes the following formula to distinguish between the two tenses: *Der Sprechende oder Schreibende bezeichnet durch das Imperfekt die von ihm als dauernd, durch den Indicativ des Aorists die als dauerlos aufgefasste, der Zeitstufe der Vergangenheit zugeteilte Handlung.*³

¹Cf. Schmalz, Müller's Handb. II², p. 404, who, however, uses the noun *Eintritt*, not the present participle.

²Cf. in this connection the strictures of the late Prof. Whitney in A. J. P. XIII 290 f.

³The original words have been quoted and no attempt at a translation made, because the words *dauernd* and *dauerlos*, as has been stated, are ambiguous, and while *dauerlos* may be rendered with the same ambiguity by

Dauernd here becomes *dauernd aufgefasst*, and *eintretend* becomes *dauerlos aufgefasst*. The cause of the change is not far to seek. It plainly appears from H.'s own explanation of his formula¹ that in his mind the idea of length of time is prominently associated with the word *dauernd*, and that to him *eintretend* is virtually the same as *momentan*. This being his conception of the terms *dauernd* and *eintretend*, at least at this stage of his treatment, our author cannot but have felt that the original formula would not satisfactorily account for the aorist in such sentences as *ἔτη πέντε καὶ τριάκοντα τὴν ἡσυχίαν ἔσχον, ἐπέμενε τρεῖς ημέρας*,² nor for the use of the imperfect of verbs of momentary occurrences, and it was, no doubt, to meet this difficulty that he proposed the above-mentioned changes.

The new formula, however, is no better than the old. A few moments' reflection will show that it is at best a mere makeshift. In the first place, *dauerlos*, viewed in the light of Hultsch's explanation above referred to, hardly expresses the right conception of the aorist. When, for example, Polybios says *ἐπέμενε τρεῖς ημέρας* or *ἔτη πέντε καὶ τριάκοντα τὴν ἡσυχίαν ἔσχον*, as above quoted, it would seem preposterous, in view of the definite expression of time, to say that he conceived the action as having no duration. The idea of a certain length of time may not have entered into the conception of the *ἐπέμενε* or may have entered only as a secondary consideration, but that is entirely different from saying that the idea of the absence of length of time, or, in other words, the idea of instantaneity formed the determining element of Polybios' choice.³

without duration, no ambiguous expression can be found to correspond to *dauernd*. 'Having duration' will not do, as *dauernd* can hardly be said to be the exact counterpart of *dauerlos*.

¹ P. 7: "Also nicht die längere oder kürzere Dauer der Handlung an sich, sondern die subjective Auffassung des Erzählers entscheidet für die Wahl des Imperfekts oder Aorists," and a little further on: "Solche Verba und Redeweisen welche den Begriff einer dauernden Handlung schon in sich tragen, werden zumeist im Imperfekt sich vorfinden; andere, die an sich ein plötzliches Eintreten oder ein kürzestes Geschehen bezeichnen, werden in den meisten Fällen in der Form des Aorists erscheinen."

² Cited by Hultsch, p. 10.

³ Hultsch later on did actually make the mistake of supposing that *dauerlos aufgefasst* was only a negative definition. In a reference to this formula he says: "Wenn wir vor kurzem sagten, dass durch den *Aorist* eine Handlung als *dauerlos aufgefasst* werde, so haben wir diese Zeitform . . . doch schon insofern bestimmt, als wir von ihrem Bereiche das weite Gebiet des Imperfekts und der übrigen Formen der Dauer ausschlossen. Allein an Stelle der Verneinung 'dauerlos' sind nun weiter positive Merkmale zu setzen."

However this may be, the formula is liable to yet another and graver objection. It is too indefinite. The use of the aorist and of the imperfect is made to depend upon the point of view of the speaker or writer, but no statement is made as to whether there is more than one legitimate point of view in every case in which an imperfect or an aorist is used by a Greek writer, or whether the possibility of a difference of conception is limited, and, if so, to what extent and how? Indeed, the formula thus unmodified would lead the unwary to suppose that according to Hultsch the use of the aorist and of the imperfect was purely subjective. As a matter of fact our author does give this explanation of the formula when he says immediately following: "Also nicht die längere oder kürzere Dauer der Handlung an sich, sondern die *subjective Auffassung* des Erzählers entscheidet für die Wahl des Imperfekts oder Aorists." But this statement once made, Hultsch awakes to the untenability of his position, and in the modification he proposes we are brought face to face with a new stage in the author's presentation of the theory of the imperfect and the aorist.

This new stage is introduced by the words: "Doch soll damit nicht gesagt sein, dass nicht auch objective Unterscheidungsgründe in Betracht kämen, und besonders der Stil eines Geschichtsschreibers wird an gewisse, häufig wiederkehrende Auffassungsweisen sich binden, welche dem Leser als feste, objectiv gültige Regeln erscheinen." Then follows the statement that such verbs or expressions as by their meaning suggest the notion of duration will generally be found in the imperfect, while others that designate the idea of a sudden occurrence or express an action characterized by great rapidity will generally be found in the aorist. Lastly, we are informed that the consideration of the peculiar circumstances, conditions, customs, manners and institutions of individuals and states exercises a constant influence upon the author in his choice of the tenses, and that the reader thus gains the impression that certain tenses are adapted to certain modes of expression and methods of representation. Though a lack of definiteness, similar to that which characterized some of Hultsch's earlier statements, is noticeable here also, yet we are warranted in drawing the conclusion that, whatever other influences, real or imaginary, Hultsch may refer to in the above presentation of his views, he is of the opinion that the absolute length of the action forms the supreme determining factor in the

choice of the imperfect and the aorist, and that the exceptions to the rule are to be accounted for by differences of point of view on the part of the narrator. The truth of this conclusion is further borne out by Hultsch's classification and description of the various uses of the imperfect. He says in substance as follows: "There are three fundamental significations of the imperfect: duration (*Dauer*), evolution (*Entwickelung*) and description (*Schilderung*). The imperfect of *duration* and *repetition* is determined solely by objective considerations. There is no conflict between the point of view of the narrator and that of the reader. Even the beginner may be expected to use such an imperfect correctly. A certain amount of the subjective element enters when the imperfect of a past protracted or repeated action is converted into the imperfect of *evolution*. Even actions that of themselves do not express duration may be viewed as only beginning and continuing for a certain length of time, but not reaching their final consummation, and in such cases the imperfect expresses preparation, occupation, endeavor. The imperfect of description is purely subjective, and is often used when least expected by the reader. 'Or,' says Hultsch, 'were not the Athenians obliged to resort to speedy and hasty measures when news was received of Philip's entrance through Thermopylae? And yet Demosthenes decor. 169 uses the imperfect in reporting: *τούς τ' ἐκ τῶν σκηνῶν τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἀγορὰν ἔξειργον καὶ τὰ γέρρα ἐνεπίμπρασαν, οἱ δὲ τοὺς στρατηγοὺς μετεπέμποντο, etc.*'"

It will be noticed that Hultsch fails to give a definition of the various categories of the imperfect. On the contrary, he tells us that it is impossible in every case to make a rigid distinction between the three uses. But in stating the reason he launches a fourth theory of the imperfect. "Natürlich," says he, "denn alle Kategorien sind eng verwandt und gehen von der gemeinsamen Anschauung aus, dass eine Handlung der Vergangenheit nicht an und für sich, sondern in zeitlicher Beziehung auf andere, seien es nun ausdrücklich erwähnte oder stillschweigend gedachte Handlungen in Betracht kommt, dass sie neben anderen Handlungen einhergeht, dass sie eingreift in andere Kreise der Thätigkeit, kurz dass sie alles andere als in sich abgeschlossen ist." As it is quite as true of the aorist that it may be viewed with reference to its temporal relations to other actions, that it may be parallel with other actions, that it may enter into other spheres of activity, and that hence it is not, to that extent at least, "*in sich abge-*

schlossen," it seems rather unsafe to make such considerations the common starting-point of the various uses of the imperfect, the more so as there is a general consensus of opinion to the effect that neither the imperfect nor the aorist as such expresses relative time.

Hultsch next gives a general outline of the various uses of the aorist. As the expression "dauerlos aufgefasst" of his second formula appeared to him to present only the negative side of the aorist (see above, p. 145, note 3), we are now invited by him to view the characteristics of the positive side (*positive Merkmale*). He states, in the first place, that the more he examined his large collection of passages from Polybios with reference to the aorist, the more he was impressed with the fact that the action expressed by the aorist was conceived as "*in sich zusammengedrängt* und deshalb im Sinne des Sprechenden *abgeschlossen*". As for the term *in sich zusammengedrängt*, the precise relation it holds to the term *abgeschlossen* is not apparent. It does not appear whether the concentration of the action is carried on to the extent of its becoming a point and finality is reached in that way, or whether by *eine in sich zusammengedrängte Handlung* is meant only an action that is viewed in its entirety, and as entirety involves completion, so the term *in sich zusammengedrängt* involves the term *abgeschlossen*, or whether the transition takes place in some other way. So much, however, is certain, that the notion of finality is regarded as proceeding from the notion of concentration, and in view of this fact it seems a little surprising that in Hultsch's further discussion of the aorist the *in sich zusammengedrängt* plays such a minor rôle, while the *abgeschlossen*, at least in so far as it is contained in the expression *abschliessender Bericht*, figures so prominently as to be everywhere made the final test. With regard to the term *abgeschlossen*, Hultsch observes that he has followed E. Koch, Griech. Schulgrammatik, §96, in returning to a designation which, while closely corresponding to the *συντελικός* used by the Alexandrine grammarians to distinguish the forms of the aorist from the durative forms, is at the same time free from the objectionable features attaching to the use of the Greek expression. "Denn wie," says he, "sollte das dem Aoriste beigelegte *συντελικός* von der *συντέλεια* die dem Perfect zugeschrieben wurde (Anecdota, p. 889) und die jenem Tempus den Namen *ἐνεστώς συντελικός* gab (Anecd., p. 891) unterschieden werden? Hierüber gibt auch

F. Blass, der in seinen Demosthenischen Studien (a. a. O. S. 429 vgl. mit S. 407 ff.) den Aorist als Tempus der *Vollendung* deutet keine Auskunft." But why should Blass stop to explain a thing which every Greek grammarian ought to understand. According to the combined statements of Dionysius Thrax and Apollonius Dyscolus, whether those statements be correct or not, there are three tenses of the past that express completion (*συντέλεια, συντελείωσις*), the aorist, the perfect and the pluperfect. The *συντέλεια* in each case is the same. The aorist expresses the past completion without further modification (*ἀόριστος*). The perfect qualifies the past completion by stating it as a present fact (*συντέλεια ἐνεστῶσα*), and the pluperfect is merely the perfect thrown into the past (*ὑπερσυντελικός*). As for the relative merits of the terms *abgeschlossen* and *vollendet*, the former undeniably possesses for the German the advantage of enabling him to speak of an "abschliessender" aorist; but apart from this, it is just a trifle hard to see how the term *vollendet* involves difficulties that are not also inherent in the term *abgeschlossen*. It seems to be merely a case of the substitution of one synonym for another,¹ unless indeed the idea of completion is to be excluded from the meaning of the word *abgeschlossen*, and *Abschluss* is to be nothing more than *cessation*. Such a definition, however, besides doing violence to the German language, would convey a radically wrong conception of the use of the aorist.

Continuing his discussion of the use of the aorist, Hultsch states that he has found no occasion upon the basis of Polybian usage to institute a separate category to be designated as the *momentary aorist*. On the contrary, says he, there is nothing to prevent the historian from using the imperfect of description in the case of an action of ever so short a duration. Not the instantaneity of the action, but the conception, on the part of the narrator, that the action is concluded (*abgeschlossen*) is responsible for the use of the aorist. After thus virtually condemning a theory which, though long since exploded,² still finds a lodging-place in certain reputable text-books, it is to be regretted that

¹ As a proof of this fact, if proof be needed, cf. Krüger, Gr. Sprachl., §53, 3 and 4, who uses the term *Abgeschlossenheit* side by side with *vollendet* to define both the perfect and the pluperfect (not the aorist), and Gerth, Gr. Schulgr.², §§271 b, 275, and 275, 4, who uses *Vollendung* (*vollendet*) and *Abschluss* (*abgeschlossen*) as synonymous terms with reference to the perfect.

² See Gildersleeve, A. J. P. IV 160. Even Delbrück, Syntakt. Forsch. V, p. 280, intimates that the term *momentan* is unsatisfactory.

Hultsch should in so far have deferred to the erroneous opinions of illustrious scholars as to admit that, for the purposes of elementary grammar, there might be some advantage in speaking of a momentary aorist, on the supposition that the beginner would thus be easily led to associate the notion of brief, summary and final report with the fact of a sudden or momentary occurrence.

Passing on to the consideration of the so-called *ingressive* aorist, our author has the following to say. When the speaker conceives an action as concentrated and makes a final report about it, he will be apt in certain cases to picture to himself the action at the moment of its entrance into existence. The reader thus gains the impression that the aorist designates ingress (*Eintreten*), and in so far it is perfectly legitimate to speak of an *ingressive* aorist, which, when translated into other languages, often requires the use of expressions that differ distinctly from the renderings adopted for the durative forms of the same verb. But Hultsch cannot agree with Koch, 13th ed., in differentiating between the ingress of a *state* and the ingress of an *action*, and in instituting, upon the basis of this distinction, an *ingressive imperfect* by the side of an *ingressive aorist*. He makes the point against Koch that *κατέσχον* and *ἔσχον*, which are at times confessedly *ingressive*, designate *actions* and not *states*. Contrary to Koch, he believes that the aorist is the proper tense for ingress of action as well as of state, and he points out the fact that there is a sharp and unmistakable difference between the *ingressive aorist* and the so-called *imperfect of evolution*, which difference he formulates thus: "Die früher einmal eingetretene Handlung gilt, wenn durch den Aorist ausgedrückt, zugleich als abgeschlossen; die sich entwickelnde Handlung geht weiter fort und greift in andere Handlungen ein." Though Koch is by no means to be complimented on his use of the term *Eintritt* in connection with the *imperfect*, and though the value of his distinction between the *Eintritt* of a *Handlung* and that of a *Zustand* would depend upon the definitions of the words *Eintritt*, *Handlung* and *Zustand*, nevertheless he deserves credit for having called a halt to the wholesale manufacture of *ingressive aorists*, and it is but due to him to quote here the statement made by him with reference to this subject, in Jahrb. 146 (1892), p. 440: "Unter den 881 aorist-indicativ-formen habe ich *keine* gefunden, der ich die bedeutung des *eintritts der handlung* zusprechen könnte; trotz der aller-neuesten grammatischen (Vollbrecht, §226 a) bleibt Xenophon dabei,

nicht den aorist *ἔφυγον*, sondern das imperfect *ἔφευγον* im sinne unsers deutschen 'sie wandten sich zur flucht' zu gebrauchen (III 4, 4; III 5, 1; dagegen *ἔφυγον πρὸς ἔκεινος* sie sind geflohen), wohl aber finden sich einige aoriste welche den eintritt eines *gemäßszustandes* (*ἡγάσθη* I 1, 9, *ἱράσθη* IV 6, 3) und somit den abschluss eines werden bezeichnen." Hultsch, on the other hand, seems to have thrown the doors wide open to the influx of all manner of ingressive aorists, for the limitations he would place on the use of the ingressive aorist are not put in a tangible shape.

The author of 'Die erzählenden Zeitformen' closes his introductory chapter with a few remarks on the differences between the aorist and the perfect. He states that there is no possibility of confusion between these two tenses either in theory or in practice. From the point of view of the 'kind of time' the perfect expresses completion; from the point of view of the 'sphere of time' it belongs to the present. It therefore enters into close proximity with the present indicative, but not with the aorist indicative, which has nothing to do with the sphere of the present. Thus far Hultsch.¹ The writer heartily concurs with that portion of the above statement which maintains that there is no possibility of confusion between the aorist and the perfect in *theory*. Indeed, from the days of Krüger to the present day there has never been any possibility of confounding any one of the tenses with any other in point of *theory*. But how about the *practice*? Not only does the aorist at times get dangerously close to the perfect, as, for instance, in the well-known passage from Aeschines (1, 99), cited by Hultsch himself: *τῶν θεραπαινῶν καὶ τῶν οἰκετῶν οὐδένα κατέλιπεν ἀλλ' ἀπαντά πέπρακε*, but it also serves as a substitute for the perfect (cf. Gildersleeve, A. J. P. IV 429); and more than this, even the perfect approaches the aorist when the perfect is dated. But it is high time to pass from these purely theoretical discussions to the consideration of the most important facts of Polybian usage. For the sake of brevity and clearness, the substance of Hultsch's statements will be presented at the top of the page, and such occasional remarks as the writer may feel called upon to make will be placed in notes at the bottom of the page.

Chaps. II-IV. The three great uses of the Imperfect.—Chap. II. The imperfect of *duration* (*Dauer*) is common in Polybios, though there is no mistaking the fact that wherever practicable

¹ For a fuller discussion of Polybios' usage see p. 180 f.

the action is viewed as preparatory or developing, and so there are many more examples of the imperfect of evolution (*Entwicklung*) than of the imperfect of duration, and even some of the instances of the latter might very well be classed under the former. The notion of duration undoubtedly prevails in such passages as ἐπολέμουν ἐν τοῖς ἔξης χρόνοις πρὸς τοὺς ἀστυγείτονας Polyb. 1, 6, 3. Cf. 1, 6, 4. 7. 7, 10. 20, 5. etc. Also in imperfects like εὐδοκίμει 1, 52, 1; διηπίστουν 4, 71, 6 and others. Next are to be noted the durative forms οὐδεῖς ἐτόλμα 3, 6, 10. 14, 9, and ἐπειράτο 3, 14, 10, ἐπειράτο elsewhere being an imperfect of evolution. The notion of duration is especially prominent when the imperfect occurs side by side with the pluperfect, as e. g. in Πόπλιος παρὰ τοῖς 'Ρωμαιοῖς ηδόξει καὶ διεβέβλητο 1, 52, 2. Cf. 2, 18, 1. 10, 15, 3. 27, 12.

Quite in conformity with the real nature of the imperfect, it designates the duration of minor actions that parallel a principal action. This use of the imperfect of duration is especially conspicuous in clauses introduced by γάρ. Cf. 4, 67, 1-3. 86, 8-87, 2 and 87, 5. Here belongs also the use of the imperfect in explanatory relative clauses and the use of the imperfect in temporal clauses, though this latter construction is rather less common. Examples of the imperfect in temporal clauses are 29, 19, 7 f. 22, 5, 10, 5, 68, 1. 3, 116, 10.

Not uncommon is the use of the Greek imperfect in explanatory dependent sentences where the English would use the progressive form of the past perfect, but if the completion is specially to be emphasized, the pluperfect is used in such clauses also.

The imperfect of duration is used of actions that are viewed with special reference to other contemporaneous actions, or, in other words, where there is a *synchronism*. It is the rule with verbs signifying *to expect*, *await*, *endure* (*προσεκαρτέρει*, *ἐτήρει*, *ἐπετήρει*, *προσεδόκων*, *ἐκαραδόκει*, *ἀπεκαραδόκει*, *ἔξ-*, *ἀν-*, *προσ-*, *προσανθέχετο*), and it is especially frequent with *μένω* and its compounds, though here the aorist is not infrequently used where the imperfect might be expected.¹

Closely connected with the idea of a past *duration* is the idea of a past *repetition*. The repetition is often specially indicated by the use of adverbs. The imperfect is the rule, though in exceptional cases a repeated action may be viewed as consummated (*abgeschlossen*), and then the aorist will be used. Cf. 1,

¹ See below, p. 175 f.

2, 2 ὁσάκις ἐτόλμησαν ὑπερβῆναι τοὺς τῆς Ἀσίας ὄρους, οὐ μόνον ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ σφῶν ἐκινδύνευσαν.

The imperfect of duration also embraces many imperfects of such verbs as *πάγειν*, *ἔχειν* and *ἰστάναι*, which will receive separate treatment hereafter,¹ and lastly it is to be noted that many an imperfect of *evolution* may also be viewed as an imperfect of *duration*.

Chap. III. The imperfect is often used by Polybius to express the *evolution* of an action, or to *describe* an event. For in the words of Polybius (5, 21, 6), *βούλόμεθα πάντες οὐχ οὔτως τὸ γεγονός ὡς τὸ πῶς ἐγένετο γινώσκειν*. The mere occurrence of an action is expressed by the aorist, but the *how* of the action, the circumstances under which it takes place, the peculiar way in which it was executed, are expressed by the imperfect.

The action that is in the process of evolution may sometimes be expressly designated as in its first stages. So in *ἡρχέτο τῆς πολιορκίας* 10, 31, 7² and in five other similar passages, or when *τὰς μὲν ἀρχάς, κατὰ μὲν τὰς ἀρχάς, τὸ μὲν πρώτον* and similar expressions are used to introduce the clause containing the imperfect.

The principal events of a war are narrated in the aorist, but the imperfect is the tense used to indicate the temper and the circumstances under which the opposing parties enter the war.—*μέλλω* in the sense of 'to be on the point of, be minded' is used only in the durative forms, no matter what the tense of the dependent infinitive, and Hultsch expressly states that he does not remember coming across a single aorist of *μέλλειν* in the above signification.³

¹Cf. chaps. X, XII, XV, XVI and XXIV.

²It might be well to note that the action that is represented as being in its first stages is contained in the genitive in five of the six instances cited by Hultsch, and in the infinitive in the remaining instance. The mere fact that *ἀρχεῖσθαι* means *begin* does not account for the tense of *ἡρχέτο*. In Polybius, e. g., we read *τῆς ἐπὶ τῷ βέλτιον ἡρξαντο προκοπῆς* 1, 12, 7; *ἔγχειρεν ἡρξαντο* 2, 71, 7; *ἡρξαντο συμφρονεῖν* 4, 1, 6; *ἡρξατο λοιδορεῖν* 5, 49, 3; *ἡρξατο προσάγειν* 5, 99, 10, and so the aorist in ten other passages, cited by H. IV, p. 451. In Thucydides there are only two imperfects of *ἀρχεῖσθαι* as compared with sixteen aorists indicative. In Demosthenes only one imperfect indicative is used over against seven aorists indicative. Further to be noted in this connection is the fact that the regular tense of the infinitive dependent upon *ἀρχεῖσθαι* is the present. About the only exception to this rule in classic Greek, at least so far as can be ascertained with the help of the indexes, seems to be the formula *ἡρξατο γενέσθαι*. But see Marchant's note on Thuc. 2, 47, 3.

³In Thucydides a similar state of affairs prevails. In addition to more than a hundred other durative forms of *μέλλω*, there are 68 imperfects, and by far

Not only the general preparations for war, but also special preparations, such as the levying and recruiting of soldiers, leading them to the scene of war, the preparations for a fight, the entrance into battle, the progress of the fight, are expressed by the imperfect wherever (as is the rule) the action is to be portrayed in its evolution or is to be described. Especially to be noted in this connection are the imperfects of *καταγράφειν* and *ἀθροίζειν*. Like the imperfect of duration, the imperfect of evolution is also found in relative and temporal clauses.

Chap. IV. The imperfect of *description* (*Schilderung*) has been explained above.¹ As model examples from Polybios may be cited *ἐξεπήδων* and *διεφθείροντο* 14, 4, 7-10; *ἀπεχώρουν* 3, 67, 2 f.; *ἐποιεῖτο τὴν ἀποχώρησιν* and *ἀπεχώρουν* 4, 69, 1-7. Noteworthy are the imperfects of *διαφθείρειν*, *ἀπόλλυμι*, *ἀποθνήσκω* and the like. Specially interesting is the imperfect *διεφθείροντο* of 3, 84, 8 as compared with the aorist *διεφθάρησαν* of §10. The aorist in this case briefly states the final issue; the imperfect expresses precisely the same fact, but there is connected with it the subjective coloring to which the name of *description* (*Schilderung*) has here been applied.

The imperfect is the favorite tense in the description of battles, sieges and other similar military operations. Cf. 1, 23, 3-10; 1, 50, 8-51, 12; 2, 29, 5-31, 2; 3, 72-74; 4, 71, 8-11; 9, 3, 1-4; 10, 12-15. The *τέλος ἐγκλίναντες ἔφευγον* at the close of the description of the naval battle off Mylae 1, 23, 3-10 and the *τέλος τραπέντες ἔφευγον* in the narrative of the capture of Psophis 4, 71, 8-11 furnish the means for a very instructive comparison. In the former case the aorist *ἔφευγον* represents the decisive event, in the latter the imperfect *ἔφευγον*² forms one of the elements of description, and the decisive event is narrated with the help of the aorists *ἐπέβησαν* and *ἡνάγκασαν*.

the largest portion of these forms is used in the sense indicated above. Of aorists there are only seven. One of these aorists is used in the sense of *tarry* and is a participle; two aorist participles and three aorists indicative are used as substitutes for the pluperfect, and one is used parallel with an aorist in the sentence *ἐν μέντοι τῷ πολέμῳ οὐδὲν ἐκπρεπέστερον ἵπποι ήμῶν οὔτε ἐπάθετο οὔτε ἐμελλόσατε* Thuc. 3, 55, 2. A closer search might possibly reveal an instance or two of the aorist even in Polybios.

¹Cf. p. 147 of this paper.

²The case of *ἔφευγον* is hardly fairly stated. *ἔφευγον* means, as a rule, 'they took to their heels, started to run,' without stating whether their efforts were successful, this being implied by the aorist. So in this case the *ἔφευγον* merely tells us that those in the city *started* for the acropolis (*οἱ μὲν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως*

Chaps. V–XXVII. As indicated above, p. 140, chapters V–XXVII treat of the imperfect and the aorist of certain classes of verbs, chaps. XV–XXVII being reserved for such verbs as are specially important from the point of view of textual criticism. Everywhere Polybios' fondness for the imperfect of evolution and the imperfect of description is plainly seen. The use of the aorist is treated along with that of the imperfect. The discussion leads off with chap. V. *Verbs of Endeavor* (exclusive of *ἐπιβάλλεσθαι*). The so-called imperfect of endeavor (*conatus*) is closely related to the use of the imperfects *ἥρχόμην*,¹ *ἥμελλον* and the like, discussed above in chap. III. *διδόναι* and *πείθειν*, as elsewhere, so in Polybius, furnish striking examples of this use. But as a general rule, when the mere attempt of an action is to be recorded, Polybius uses an express verb of endeavor, usually *πειρᾶσθαι*, with the infinitive. In narrative, the tense most frequently used is the imperfect,² and the dependent infinitive is likewise durative. Hultsch cites 30 examples of this durative combination, but has noted but a single example (11, 17, 4) to show the exceptional use of the aorist infinitive with the durative forms of *πειρᾶσθαι*. Only four examples of the aorist of *πειρᾶσθαι* have been noted, and in each case the dependent infinitive is likewise in the aorist. An example each of the aorist and of the imperfect of the active *πειρᾶν* without the infinitive are recorded. Of *ἀποπειρᾶσθαι* with the genitive and *καταπειράζειν* with the genitive or without an object, the durative forms seem to be the rule, and none other are cited. *ἔγχειρειν* and *ἐπιχειρεῖν* in Polybius take either the dative (one example of *πρὸς* with the acc. is cited) or the infinitive. Ten examples of the imperfect of these verbs and about 20 instances of the aorist are noted.³ As to the tense of the dependent infinitive, there is no rule as there is in the case of *πειρᾶσθαι* (see above) and of *συμβαίνειν* and *συγκυρεῖν* (see below, chap. XIX).

τραπέντες ἔφενγον πάντες πρὸς τὴν ἀκρόπολιν), and they are left in their flight until in §13 information is given of their safe arrival (*οἱ μὲν οὖν Ψωφίδοι μετὰ τέκνων καὶ γυναικῶν ἀπεχώρησαν εἰς τὴν ἄκραν, ἀما δὲ τούτους οἱ περὶ τὸν Εὐριπίδαν, δούιώς δὲ καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν πλῆθος τῶν διασφόμενων).* ἔφενγον then, in the above passage, can hardly be counted as a purely subjective imperfect of description, and the same, by the way, may also be said of more than one of the imperfects above cited by Hultsch as model instances of such a use.

¹ But see our note on *ἥρχετο*, p. 153.

² Thuc. also prefers the imperfect of *πειρᾶσθαι*, no aorist indicative occurring.

³ Both imperfect and aorist indicative of *ἐπιχειρεῖν* are used in Thucydides also, but the aorist indicative is more common than the imperfect.

The imperfects of *έγχειριν* and *έπιχειριν* are found not only with the present infinitive, but also with the aorist, whilst *ένεχείρησα* is used but once with the aorist infinitive, the present being elsewhere used. Similar variations in the tense of the dependent infinitive are found also in the case of *έπιβάλλεσθαι* and of verbs signifying to 'make haste.' All these variations are not the result of chance, but are designed by the author.

Chap. VI. Expressions of *Doubt and Perplexity*.—The predominant use of the imperfect in the case of numerous verbs and expressions of doubt and perplexity is the natural consequence of the meaning of such expressions. Besides *ἀπορεῖν* and its compounds may be mentioned *παρέχειν τινὶ ἀπορίαν*, *δυσχρηστίαν*, *δυσχέρειαν*; *ἀπορίας*, *δυσχρηστίας πλήρη εἶναι*; *ἀπόρως*, *δυσχρήστως ἔχειν*, *διακεῖσθαι*; *δυσχρηστίαν εἶναι*, *γίγνεσθαι*; *δυσχρηστεῖσθαι* (cf. also chap. XXIV below). With *ἀπόρως* and *δυσχρηστώς ἔχειν* are connected the expressions *δυσχερῶς ἔχειν*, *δυσχερῶς βαρέως φέρειν*, *δυσχεραίνειν* and others, and these in turn are found accompanied by a verb like *σχετλάζειν*. With all the above expressions the imperfect is the rule. The aorist, when used, is *ingressive* (cf. *ἔδυσχρηστησαν* 21, 4, 14), or else it is used simply to express the final conclusion of a past action (die abgeschlossene Handlung der Vergangenheit), as in 4, 34, 1, and may then even be accompanied by adverbs that express a certain amount of duration, as in 1, 10, 3 *'Ρωμαῖοι πολὺν χρόνον ἡπόρησαν*.

Chap. VII. Verbs of *haste*.—In accordance with general usage, *σπεύδειν* and *διασπεύδειν*, whether construed with the genitive or with the infinitive, are not infrequently found in the aorist. So also *καταταχεῖν*. The attendant infinitive or participle in all these cases is likewise in the aorist. But Polybios' desire for descriptive effect has caused him to use also the imperfect of *σπεύδειν*, perhaps more frequently than the aorist, and the imperfects of *ἐπείγεσθαι* and *σπουδάζειν* are used to the almost entire exclusion of the aorist, no aorist of *ἐπείγεσθαι* and only one of *σπουδάζειν* having been noted.¹ The tense of the verbs depending on the imperfect and present participle of *σπεύδειν* and *σπουδάζειν* varies. In the

¹ To guard against the possibility of supposing that Polybios' usage with reference to the verbs above cited is isolated, it will be well to note that in Thucydides *σπεύδειν*, though not very common, is only durative. The aorist occurs in other authors, but the durative forms seem, upon the whole, to prevail. There is no aorist indicative of *ἐπείγεσθαι* in Thuc., but there are a number of imperfects. *σπουδάζειν* is not used by Thucydides.

examples recorded, the aorist preponderates. The periphrasis *σπουδὴν ποιεῖσθαι* for *σπουδάζειν* is rather common, and is found only in the imperfect.

Chap. VIII. Aorist and Imperfect of verbs accompanied by *expressions of speed*.—When the participle *σπεύδων* is used with verbs of *military movement*, these verbs are used in the imperfect. Such is the case also when ideas like *quickly*, *rapidly*, *forthwith* are expressed by means of participial or adverbial expressions, or by the adjective *ταχύς*. Moreover, there is quite a string of adverbs meaning *forthwith*, *at once*, *in haste*, *quickly* that are connected with the imperfect no less frequently than with the aorist. The list is as follows: *ἐξ αὐτῆς*, *εὐθέως*, *εὐθύς*, *παραυτίκα*, *παραχρῆμα*, *ἐκ πόδος*, *κατὰ πόδας*, *παρὰ πόδας*, *σπουδῇ*, *κατὰ σπουδήν*, *μετὰ σπουδῆς*, *ταχέως*, *ταχύ*, *κατὰ τάχος*, *τὴν ταχίστην*, and one or two others. There are four points of view that may determine the choice of the tenses—two for the aorist and two for the imperfect. On the one hand, any sudden, immediate action may convey to the narrator the notion of ‘entrance into reality’ (*Eintritt in die Wirklichkeit*) or that of a sudden, abrupt conclusion (*kurz abgeschlossen*), and this will call for the aorist. On the other hand, the startling character of a sudden, unexpected action may have the tendency to attract general attention, or that which is done rapidly and hastily may suggest the idea of something imperfect, something in the state of evolution, and so we should expect the imperfect—in the one case that of description, in the other that of evolution. The above-mentioned adverbs are so frequently used with verbs of *sending* that an exhibit of this use is here given independently of the later special treatment of verbs of sending: Out of 57 instances noted, the aorist occurs 24 times, the imperfect 33 times; the use of the imperfect with *εὐθέως*, *εὐθύς*, *παραυτίκα* is more than three times as common as that of the aorist; with *παραχρῆμα*, however, there is a decided preponderance of the aorist; in the case of other adverbs of this class, the imperfect and the aorist are found with about the same degree of frequency. The great frequency of the imperfect of *ἄγειν* and compounds with adverbs meaning ‘forthwith’ is also to be noted. Following is a summary of all the instances recorded of the use of the imperfect and aorist indicative with the above class of adverbs. The first of the two figures accompanying each adverb or adverbial phrase designates the number of the imperfects, the second the number

of the aorists. ἐξ αὐτῆς 8, 16; εὐθέως 87, 38⁺¹; εὐθύς 5, 3; παραντίκα 24, 24; παραχρῆμα 10, 28; ἐκ ποδός 2, 1; κατὰ πόδας 1, —; παρὰ πόδας 2, 9; σπουδὴ 4, 2; κατὰ σπουδὴν 13, 13; μετὰ σπουδῆς 13, 4; ταχέως 9, 37; ταχύ 1, 5.

Chaps. IX-XII. Verbs of GOING AND COMING, including *Military Movements* by land and by sea.—Chap. IX. Verbs of *Going* and *Coming*.—Compounds of *βαίνω*, as a rule, are probably more frequently durative than aoristic, but *ἀποβαίνειν* in the sense of *expire, come to an end, turn out to be* shows a decided preponderance of the aorist. Compounds of *ἰέναι* furnish frequent examples of the imperfect of evolution, but the corresponding aoristic forms of *ἥλθον*, especially of the compounds of *ἥλθον*, are exceedingly common, and are everywhere used in accordance with the general rules. *πορεύεσθαι* and compounds are more frequently found as duratives than as aorists, and the imperfect is the predominating narrative tense. To express ‘*arrival*,’ Polybios occasionally uses *ἀφικνεῖσθαι*. As a rule, however, *παραγίνεσθαι* is preferred, and of this the imperfect in common use in Polybios is *παρῆν*, *παρεγινόμην* being of less frequent occurrence. The aorist *παρεγενόμην*, *παρεγενήθην* is common enough, but the imperfect of evolution or description is very frequently used, and often used when, according to general usage, the aorist might have been expected. The imperfect of *ἥκω* is used not only as a pluperfect, but also as an imperfect or an aorist. It is sometimes hard to decide between the imperfect and the aoristic use, but the question is one that is of importance only to us moderns, who have been taught by rules of syntax to differentiate between the two uses; to the ancient writer the characteristic notions of the imperfect and the aorist were in the case of this verb blended in one form. *ἀπαλλάττεσθαι* in the sense of ‘to depart’ occurs a number of times in the imperfect, especially with adverbs denoting “forthwith, speedily.”

Chap. X. *ἄγειν* and COMPOUNDS *expressing military movements*.—As all movements of troops, from the very nature of the case, are mere preparations for subsequent events, and inasmuch as these movements are directed in accordance with a definite plan mapped out by the general, it is quite natural that they should be

¹ Hultsch gives 38 references of the use of the aor. and adds “und anderwärts.” ‘Anderwärts’ presumably stands for *in a few other cases*, and the impf. is the more common tense. But how is one to know with certainty from what H. says?

reported in the imperfect. But in Polybios 21, 43, 9 ἐπέμεινε τρεῖς ἡμέρας, κατὰ δὲ τὴν τετάρτην ἀναζεύξας προῆγε, the sudden change from aorist to imperfect would be extremely hard to understand,¹ if it could not be otherwise proved that of ἄγειν, προάγειν, πορείαν ποιεῖσθαι and similar expressions of 'marching,' the imperfect is used in Polybios almost to the exclusion of the aorist indicative. The choice of these durative forms depends upon the individual point of view of the author, but in consideration of the similar usage of more ancient prose-writers and the large number of such imperfects in Polybios, we must formulate what in the first place may be looked upon as an exception to the general rule, but owing to the frequency of its application, must itself be regarded as a rule.² We proceed to give the main details of the exemplification of the rule. ἄγειν and several of its compounds, either alone or with an object like στρατόν, πορείαν, etc., are used in the sense of 'marching,' and the tense used is regularly the imperfect. In the case of the simple verb used in this sense, the rule is without exception. Of the compounds, προάγειν (which, by the way, is the most frequently used of the verbs of marching) heads the list in importance. It is used more than 100 times in the imperfect, but only once (5, 62, 1) in the aorist indicative.³ The aorist participle of προάγειν occurs 4, 19, 4 and possibly 31, 26, 5. ἀντιπαράγειν, ἐξάγειν, ἀντεξάγειν, ἐπάγειν and ἐπανάγειν, with or without an object, are used of movements of troops and are found only in the imperfect, 36 instances in all being recorded. The other compounds of ἄγειν that are more or less frequently used to express military movements are προσάγειν, συνάγειν, ἀπάγειν, διάγειν, εἰσάγειν, μετάγειν and παράγειν. No decided preference in the choice of tenses is discernible except in the case of συνάγειν, of the imperfect of which eleven instances are recorded, but none of the aorist.

¹ Hultsch seems to have found a difficulty here where really none exists. προῆγε is as fine an example of the imperfect of evolution as one could expect. The consummation is expressed by ἀφικόμενος δὲ τριταῖος εἰς κτέ.

² The fact that Hultsch acknowledges conformity of usage on the part of earlier writers ought to have kept him from applying the 'subjective' theory in this connection. It would seem rather strange that a number of earlier writers, as, for instance, Thucydides (cf. v. Essen, Ind. Thuc., sub ἄγω) and Xenophon (Koch, Jahrb. 146 (1892), p. 424, sub ἄγω), should all make the same 'subjective decision' (subjective Entscheidung) about the same thing, without occupying a common objective point of view.

³ Even here one of the MSS reads the imperfect, but Hultsch thinks that in the absence of further knowledge we are not warranted in rejecting the aorist.

Chap. XI. *Other military movements by land*.—In point of frequency, the imperfect of πορείαν ποιεῖσθαι connects itself with the imperfect of πρόγειν. There are about 32 instances of the imperfect to one of the aorist indicative. Of sundry other verbs such as κινέιν, ἡγεῖσθαι, ἐπεισθαι, ἀπαντᾶν, ἀκολουθεῖν, διανύειν, imperfects but no aorists indicative are recorded by Hultsch. ἀναχωρεῖν, ἀποχωρεῖν and ὑποχωρεῖν are found both as imperfects of description and as aorists of consummation. The aorist of ὄρμᾶν, ἀφορμᾶν, ἔξορμᾶν is very common and is the rule, only a few instances of the imperfect of evolution being noted. ἀπαίρειν and καταίρειν, of movements by land and by sea, seem to have been used in the aorist exclusively. The question as to whether ἀπῆρε and κατῆρε may not have been originally intended for the forms ἀπῆρε and κατῆρε must be answered in the negative, and even in 5, 2, 11, where there is some MS warrant for an imperfect κατῆρε, the aorist must be retained. ἀναστρατοπεδεύειν, ἀναζευγόνται, καταστρατοπεδεύειν, καταζευγόνται show an overwhelming preponderance of aoristic forms. Of στρατοπεδεύειν an exhaustive exhibit is given. There are 32 durative forms as compared with 26 aoristic forms, but of these only 4 are imperfects, while 9 are aorists indicative. The compounds ἀντιστρατοπεδεύειν, ἐπιστρατοπεδεύειν, παραστρατοπεδεύειν, περιστρατοπεδεύειν, προσστρατοπεδεύειν are not uncommon in Polybius, and in the use of the tenses follow the rules of the simple verb. ἀναλύειν 'to march back' follows ἀναχωρεῖν in the use of the tenses, and with the imperfect of ἀποχωρεῖν the form ἀπελύντο is to be compared. ἀνακομίζεσθαι 'to march back, sail back' is used only in the aorist—four times the indicative, once the participle.

Chap. XII. Verbs denoting *movements at sea*.—In the discussion of this class of verbs, πλεῖν and πλεῦσαι are the first to receive our attention. Both forms are likely to be frequently met with in an historian. But Polybius' usage is peculiar in this respect, that the simple verb πλεῖν and its periphrasis ποιεῖσθαι πλοῦν are generally used when the duration or the evolution of a voyage, or the preparation for a further undertaking, is to be expressed, whereas the aoristic¹ side is represented chiefly by the compounds, less frequently by the simple verb ἐπλευσα. The imperfect of πλεῖν

¹ Hultsch's words are: "Um dagegen das Eintreten der Handlung zu bezeichnen verwendet der Schriftsteller lieber Composita, seltener das einfache ἐπλευσα. Dass der Aorist sowohl von πλεῖν als seinen Composita auch schlechthin für die abgeschlossene Handlung, abgesehen von ihrer längeren oder kürzeren Dauer, gebraucht werde, haben wir von vornherein zu erwarten."

is cited more than 20 times, the aorist only 4 times (including one aorist participle).¹ Like *ποιεῖσθαι τὴν πορείαν* (chap. XI above), *ποιεῖσθαι τὸν πλοῦν* is almost confined to the imperfect and to the present participle, only one example of the aorist, and that a participle, having been met with.

Of the compounds of *πλεῖν*, —*ἀναπλεῖν*, *ἀποπλεῖν*, *διαπλεῖν* and *καταπλεῖν* form a group that are in so far related as the aorist is the prevailing tense. More than 40 aorists indicative are cited over against 2 imperfects. *ἐπιπλεῖν* and *παραπλεῖν*, on the other hand, as was to be expected from the meaning of these verbs, show a marked preference for the imperfect. Of *ἐκπλεῖν* the aorist is not uncommon, though the imperfect also is found. As isolated examples of other compounds of *πλεῖν* may be cited the forms *εἰσέπλευσεν*, *προκατέπλευσεν* and *ἐπανέπλει*. The expressions *ποιεῖσθαι τὸν ἀνάπλον*, *ἀπόπλον*, *ἐπίπλον* follow the analogy of *ἀναπλεῖν*, *ἀποπλεῖν* and *ἐπιπλεῖν* respectively. *ἀνάγεσθαι*, which is synonymous with *ἀναπλεῖν*, is found most frequently in the aorist, but there is quite a sprinkling of imperfects. The exclusive use of the aorist in the case of *ἀταίρειν* and *καταίρειν* (cf. *ἀποπλεῖν*, *καταπλεῖν*) was noted above, chap. XI. *διαίρειν* (cf. *διαπλεῖν*) is represented by 8 aorists (1 ind., 6 ptcs. and 1 inf.) and but 2 durative forms, both infinitives. *ἀνακομίζεσθαι*, *διακομίζεσθαι* and *παρακομίζεσθαι* are used in the aorist only, while *καθορμίζεσθαι* (cf. *καταίρειν*, *καταπλεῖν*) is overwhelmingly aoristic. The forms *ἀφώμησαν*, *πρῆγμα*, *ἐπεραιωῦτο* and *κατήχθη* may be noted as isolated instances of other verbs denoting movements at sea. For *κατέχειν* and *προσέχειν* ‘to enter port, to land,’ see chap. XXIV below.

Chap. XIII. *Verbs of Saying, Ordering, Exhorting*.—With a solitary exception, presently to be mentioned, Polybius uses this group of verbs according to the rule he has followed elsewhere. *ἔφη* is used as an imperfect far more frequently than would be expected even on the basis of Attic usage,² but despite a long string of instances of this kind, there remain a large number of examples in which *ἔφη* is used aoristically without any perceptible difference from *εἶπε* or *ἔφησε*. It is likely that considerations of a more external nature may have guided Polybius in his choice of

¹ Right here is an instance in which the non-exhaustive treatment occasions some trouble. From the words of the preceding foot-note, we should expect to find more than three aorists indicative. Thucydides has 42 imperfects of *πλεῖν* and 19 aor. ind.—a very much larger proportion of aorists.

² Cf. Gildersleeve, A. J. P. IV, p. 161 and foot-note.

one or the other of the forms. Certain it is that *ἔφησεν* is often used to avoid an objectionable hiatus that would have been occasioned by the use of *ἔφη*.¹ *εἶπον* and its compounds are regularly used of an action concluded (abgeschlossen) in the past.² By way of illustration of the use of the imperfect of verbs of saying are cited 3 examples of the imperfect of *λέγειν*, 1 of *λόγους ποιεῖσθαι*, 2 of *ἀντιλέγειν*, 1 of *προσεπιλέγειν* and 9 of *διαλέγεσθαι*, and to contrast with this array of imperfects, 3 aorists indicative of *διαλέγομαι* are recorded. Of *λαλέιν* two imperfects are noted. As in the case of *λέγω*, so also in the case of *διασαφεῖν*, the imperfect is the favorite tense,³ and 9 examples of the imperfect are noted, with but 2 of the aorist, excluding 4 instances of the aorist in which the author refers to himself.

¹ Hultsch first called attention to this fact in *Philologus*, XIV, p. 302.

² But of the whole list of examples cited for the aor. ind., only four instances of the simple verb are used in the narrative portion of Polybius' work, the greater bulk being used in such formulae as *καθάπερ ἀστίως εἶπον, εἶπα, εἴπομεν* in reference to statements previously made by the historian.

³ Here is another instance of the difficulties caused by the lack of exhaustiveness. The author cites only three examples of the imperfect of *λέγειν* and none of the aorist. Are we to take for granted that there are no more examples of the imperfect and that the aorist is altogether absent? But Hultsch says that the imperfect of *λέγειν* is the *favorite* tense. That would imply that the aorist was a less favored tense, and one or another example of its use might be expected. As a matter of fact, three examples of the aorist indicative of *διαλέγομαι* are recorded. But *διαλέγομαι* ought not, in the matter of tense-usage, to be classed with *λέγω* and its compounds, and this, by the way, is not the only instance in which incongruous matter has been lumped in one mass by the author of the treatise under discussion. Take away the *διαλέγομαι* and what is there left? A few examples of the imperfect of *λέγειν* and no aorist. But right here Hultsch, like Rutherford, New Phryne, p. 326, and First Greek Syntax, p. 88 (see Gildersleeve, A. J. P. XI 390), has overlooked the fact that *εἶπον* is the regular aorist of *λέγω* and in some authors the only aorist. Veitch, many years ago, pointed out the rareness of *ἔλεξα* in Plato and the Attic orators. Several years ago the writer of this note undertook (at the suggestion of Prof. Gildersleeve) to look into this matter somewhat more narrowly, and is therefore able to add that the aorist active of *λέγω*, rare as it is in any mood, is entirely wanting for the indicative in all the Attic orators except Antiphon and Andocides, and even for the future the *ἐρῶ* forms seem, upon the whole, to be much more common than the *λέξω* forms. Owing to the large amount of material and to lack of time, no complete statistics can here be given. For present purposes it will suffice to note that for the indicative Demosthenes has 24 *λέξω*'s,* but 127 *ἐρῶ*'s; no *ἔλεξα*, but 105 *εἶπον*'s; Thucyd-

* *λέξω, ἐρῶ, ᔘλεξα* and *εἶπον* are meant to include all the persons and numbers of the fut. and aor. ind. act. respectively.

In the case of verbs of *ordering*, the aorist is, as a rule, far more frequent than the imperfect, but the imperfect of *ἐπιτάπτειν* and *κελεύειν* is not less common than the aorist, and in the case of *παρακελεύεσθαι* the imperfect vastly predominates. The difference between the aorist and imperfect of this class of verbs may be formulated as follows. For a short, peremptory command, the aorist is the suitable tense. From the point of view of the person issuing the command, the matter is settled. But whenever the notion of ordering contains the additional element of urging, admonishing, trying to influence the subordinate, the action of ordering appears undeveloped, and the imperfect is the fitting tense. This accounts for the fact that in genuine verbs of commanding, the aorist predominates, whereas in such verbs as *ἀξιοῦν*, *παραψεῖν*, *παρακαλεῖν* and *προκαλεῖσθαι* the imperfect is used by preference.¹ We append a synopsis of the relative frequency of the

ides has 1 *λέγω*, but 3 *ἔρω*'s; 16 *ἔλεξα*'s, but 59 *εἶπον*'s. In Aristophanes also there are more *ἔρω* forms than *λέγω* forms, and *εἶπον* is decidedly more common than *ἔλεξα*. In the above statistics only the simple verbs have been noted. But to return to Polybios. Hultsch should have noted the use of *εἶπον* as *an* aorist, if not *the* aorist of *λέγω*, and then, not counting the fifty or more examples of *εἶπον* and compounds in which Polybios refers to himself, and not counting the *ἀπειπεῖν* on account of its possibly being the aorist of *ἀπαγορεύειν*, there still remain six examples of the aorist indicative of *εἶπον* and compounds against the six examples of the imperfect of *λέγειν* and compounds. As for Thucydides, there are 42 imperfects of *λέγω* to contrast with 75 *ἔλεξα* and *εἶπον* forms, and in Demosthenes there are 66 imperfects of *λέγω* to the 105 *εἶπον* forms. This is enough to prove that if there is any preponderance of the one tense over the other, it is in favor of the aorist rather than of the imperfect. But this is only the average rule, and passages can readily be found in which the imperfect of *λέγω* far outweighs the aorist.

¹ This statement of the theoretical difference between the imperfect and aorist of verbs of commanding is, in the main, more satisfactory than that of Blass, Rh. Mus. 44 (1889), 410 ff., where we read as follows: "Es giebt eine Anzahl Verba, Handlungen bezeichnend, die ihr Ziel und ihre Vollendung in dem Thun eines Andern haben, und diese Verba können in weitem Umfange als imperfecta behandelt, d. h. statt in den Aorist ins Imperfektum gesetzt werden, sobald diese Unvollständigkeit und diese Beziehung zu dem ergänzenden Thun eines Andern hervorgehoben werden soll. Dahin gehören *κελεύειν*, *ἀξιοῦν*, *παρακελεύεσθαι*, *ἔρωταν*, *λέγειν*, *πέμπειν*, *ἀποστέλλειν* u. s. w." Whilst there may be a good deal of truth in this statement, yet, worded as it is, it is liable to produce very erroneous impressions regarding the use of the tenses among the Greeks. Blass did not fail to notice this, and so, on p. 414, he gives more explicit directions with regard to *κελεύειν*, and to make matters doubly sure he says (p. 415) with reference specially to *προστάπτειν*: "Dass

tenses of different verbs of ordering and urging. No claim is laid to exhaustiveness, yet all the passages that seemed of any importance have been gathered, and the table is sufficient for all practical purposes to show the relative frequency of imperfect and aorist indicative. Of the two figures following each verb, the first gives the number of imperfects indicative, the second that of the aorists indicative. *ἐπιτάττειν* 5, 10; *προσεπιτάττειν* —, 1; *κελεύειν*¹ 21, 12; *παρακελεύεσθαι* 3, —; *παραγγέλλειν* 9, 37; *προστάττειν* —, 4; *συντάττειν*

indess nicht in der wirklich geschehenen Ausführung das Wesen des Aorists liegt, zeigen die Stellen [Ps.-Dem. 50] 53 und 50." But, after all, *προστάττειν* is something wholly different from *κελεύειν*. *προστάττειν* and especially *ἐπιτάττειν* are the words used of a peremptory command, while *κελεύειν* may be a mere *incitare*, and even in its strongest sense seems not to have been as harsh to the liberty-loving Greek as the other two words. This difference, among other things, seems to be reflected in the use of the words in ordinary Attic prose. For, if Thucydides and Demosthenes may be regarded as representatives of ordinary prose and if the writer's memory serves him correctly, *ἐπιτάττειν* is less common than *προστάττειν*, and *κελεύειν* is very much more common than either,* and, in the matter of tenses, the aorist is the narrative tense of *ἐπιτάττειν* and *προστάττειν*, whilst the imperfect is the favorite narrative tense of *κελεύειν*. This statement is partially based on the indexes. Possibly in Plato also, to judge by the amount of space given to the words, *προστάττειν* is used more frequently than *ἐπιτάττειν*, though *κελεύειν* seems to be less frequent than either of the two. It might be well, for purposes of comparison, to note the following statistics for the imperfect and aorist ind. act. respectively of *ἐπιτάττειν*, *προστάττειν* and *κελεύειν*:

	<i>ἐπιτάττειν.</i>		<i>προστάττειν.</i>		<i>κελεύειν.</i>	
	Impf.	Aor.	Impf.	Aor.	Impf.	Aor.
Thuc.	—	2	—	3	73	7
Dem.	1	3	5	27	34	25

¹ When Hultsch, p. 103, l. 7 f., says "doch sind als solche deren Imperfect nicht minder häufig als der Aorist gebraucht wird, zu verzeichnen *ἐπιτάττειν* und *κελεύειν*," it is a source of astonishment to find in the above table, which shows (see l. c., p. 109) "wie Imperfect und Aorist in der Häufigkeit des Vorkommens sich zu einander verhalten," as many as 21 imperfects of *κελεύειν* to only 12 aorists, but one is simply amazed to find only 5 imperfects to 10 aorists of *ἐπιτάττειν*. Which of these two statements is to be believed, that on p. 103 or that on p. 109? Or is neither to be trusted? If exhaustiveness had been aimed at, one would have supposed, from a comparison with the statistics of Thucydides and Demosthenes, that the figures in the table were about correct and that the statement on p. 103 was simply an oversight on Hultsch's part.

* Hence correct the statement of Cobet, N. L., p. 47: "*ἐπιτάσσειν* Tragicorum est, Comici *προστάττειν* dicebant." There seems to be absolutely no foundation for this statement. *προστάσσειν* is used also by tragic poets and *ἐπιτάσσειν* as well by comic poets, and *προστάσσειν* seems to be the more common of the two in tragedy.

2, 7; ἀξιοῦν 21, 1; παραινὲν 9, 1; παρακαλὲν 56, 12 (one being middle); προκαλεῖσθαι 3, —; ἐντέλλεσθαι —, 1; προσεντέλλεσθαι —, 2. Other expressions of *encouraging*, *exhorting*, *urging* used by Polybios are ἐκκαλεῖσθαι, προσκαλεῖσθαι, παροξύνειν, παρομᾶν, ψυχαγωγεῖν, προήχθην (γράφειν, εἰπεῖν, ἐξηγήσασθαι). Unlike other verbs of exhorting, the verbs just cited prefer the aorist.

Chap. XIV. Verbs of *Sending*.—Polybios' use of the narrative tenses of verbs of sending conforms pretty closely with the rules given for verbs of commanding and exhorting. In the sense of *dispatch* (absenden, entsenden), all the verbs of this class regularly take the aorist, and it is a matter of special note that στέλλω and its numerous compounds are represented by about four times as many aorists as imperfects. Of these, ἔξαποστέλλειν is exceptional in this respect, that relatively more imperfects of it are found than of the other compounds. The original signification of ἔξ seems to have faded, and ἔξαποστέλλειν means not *to dispatch*, but *to be engaged in sending*, *to make preparations for dispatching*, and it is this point of view that has caused Polybios to use the imperfect so freely in the case of πέμπω and its compounds, that it equals the aorist in frequency.¹ In the case of διαπέμπεσθαι and μεταπέμπεσθαι, the imperfect is far more frequent than the aorist. This is quite natural, for διαπέμπεσθαι means "to enter into negotiations by sending messengers," and μεταπέμπεσθαι "to send for," which cannot be done without a great deal of effort and preparation. Of πρεσβεύεσθαι and διαπρεσβεύεσθαι "to send ambassadors" and πρεσβεύειν "to act as ambassador," the imperfect prevails.²

¹ Compare, however, the figures recorded in the following note.

² Hultsch states that the ratio for στέλλω and compounds is based upon his collection of examples, and that this collection, while containing as complete a list of imperfects as possible, is by no means exhaustive for the aorist. Whether this remark as to the lack of exhaustiveness of the aorist is to apply to πέμπω and its compounds also cannot be gathered from the statement. For this reason we omit Hultsch's table of frequency for στέλλειν, πέμπειν and compounds, and state only that for ἔξαποστέλλειν 32 imperfects and 102 aorists ind. are recorded; for πέμπειν the figures are 22, 7; for ἐκπέμπειν 32, 48, and for διαπέμπεσθαι 13, 5. For the sake of comparison we append the following statistics for Thucydides and Demosthenes. The first two figures give the number of imperfects and aorists indic. (act. unless otherwise specified) for Thucydides and the following two numbers apply to Demosthenes. πέμπειν 16, 29; 6, 24; ἐκπέμπειν 2, 13; 2, 6; στέλλειν —, 4; —, —; ἀποστέλλειν 8, 20; 10, 8; μεταπέμπειν —, 2; —, —; μεταπέμπεσθαι (mid.) 2, 3; 6, 2. Comment on these figures is unnecessary.

Chap. XV. *ἄγειν* and compounds.—*ἄγειν* has a great variety of uses in Greek. Its use to express military movements was discussed above in chapter X. With a personal object, the imperfect is more common; with an inanimate object, the imperfect regularly expresses duration. The aorist in both cases expresses the successful conduct to a goal, or the successful transference from one state to another. *τὴν ἡσυχίαν ἄγειν* occurs frequently in the imperfect—never, as far as observation goes, in the aorist. *διάγειν* and *διεξάγειν*, like the expressions *τὸν χρόνον*, *τὴν ἀγωγήν*, *τὴν αἴρεσιν*, *τὴν εἰρίνην*, *τὴν ἡσυχίαν ἄγειν*, are used in the imperfect to express a past duration. For *διάγειν* and other compounds of *ἄγειν* to express military movements, see chaps. X and XII. For the imps. of *ἄγειν* and compounds with adverbs of *haste*, see chap. VIII. About 50 examples of the imperfect to 23 of the aorist ind. of compounds of *ἄγειν*, exclusive of *διάγειν* and *διεξάγειν* above referred to and of such uses as have been considered in the previous chapters, are cited. Especially worthy of note are the 18 instances of the imperfect of *συνάγειν*, to which only 2 aorists indicative may be opposed. Compare this use with the use of *συνάγειν* spoken of in chap. X, where 11 examples of the imperfect, but none of the aorist, are recorded.

Chap. XVI. *ἱστάναι* and compounds.—The treatment of *ἄγειν*, *ἱστάναι*, *πίπτειν*, *ποιεῖν*, *φέρειν* and compounds, and *συμβάίνειν*, is specially intended as a preparatory study for the investigation of *βάλλειν*, *γίνεσθαι*, *ἔχειν* and other verbs whose imperfect differs so slightly from the aorist in form that the two tenses may be readily confounded in the MSS. In the case of *ἱστάναι*, *ποιεῖν* and *φέρειν*, it seemed sufficient for our purpose to treat at length the peculiar use of the imperfect, and only so far as absolutely necessary to touch upon the regular use of the aorist. In the case of *πίπτειν* and *συμβάίνειν*, on the other hand, the aorist forms the starting-point, and it is only in connection with this that the imperfect has to be treated. As for *ἱστάναι*, the rather frequent use of the imperfects of *ἀφίστασθαι*, *συνιστάναι* and *συνίστασθαι* are to be noted.¹ The imperfects of *ἱστάναι* and compounds cited are the following: *ἱστασθαι* 2, *ἀφίστασθαι* 7, *διασυνιστασθαι* (conjecture of H.) 1, *ἐνιστασθαι* 2, *καθιστάναι* (act. and mid.) 3, *κατανιστασθαι* 3, *παριστάναι* 3, and *συνιστάναι* (act. tr. and mid. tr. and intr.) 13.

¹ H. states that the aorist of *ἀφίστασθαι* is more common than that of the imperfect, but in the case of *συνιστάναι* and *συνίστασθαι* he merely states that the indicative forms of *συστῆσαι*, *συστήσασθαι* and *συντῆσαι* are common and require no further mention.

Chap. XVII. *πίπτειν* and compounds.—As is natural, the aorist is the prevailing narrative tense of *πίπτειν* and its compounds. Whatever the signification, the action in most cases will appear as concluded (abgeschlossen), and it is only for special reasons that the narrator would be likely to prefer the tense of duration or evolution. By the side of a string of aorists ind. of the simple verb are found only two imperfects. Of *ἀνα-*, *ἀπο-*, *δια-*, *ἐκ-*, *παρα-*, *προ-*, *συμ-*-*πίπτειν* no imperfect has been found, though there is a respectable list of aorists. *ἐμπίπτειν* is no less common in the aorist than the other compounds, but it differs from them in having a large number of imperfects expressing duration or, more commonly, evolution. In addition to a number of imperfects of *εἰσπίπτειν* in the sense of 'entering a fortress,' there may be mentioned imperfects of *ἀντι-*, *μετα-*, *περι-*, *προσ-*, *υπεκ-*-*πίπτειν*.

Chap. XVIII. *ποιεῖν* and *ποιεῖσθαι*.—*ποιεῖν* is used to express activity in general, and so may act as a substitute for any verb of action. Hence when used to represent the imperfect of another verb, it will itself be placed in the imperfect, as in 3, 116, 4 τὸ παραπλήσιον Ἀντίβας ἐποίει (SC. παρεκάλει καὶ παρώξυνε τοὺς στρατιώτας), and elsewhere. So when *ποιεῖν* has an object accompanied by a predicate modifier, or when it is used to form a periphrasis, the imperfect is not at all uncommon. Duration, evolution and description are the determining elements. Far more common is the use of *ποιεῖσθαι* to form verbal periphrases, and Polybios is very much more fond of these periphrases than earlier writers. More than 100 of them have been casually noted, and about half of these, so far from occurring only once or twice, are repeated over and over. Here only those are considered whose imperfect is tolerably frequent. *σπουδὴν*, *πορείαν*, *πλοῦν*, *ἀνάπλον*, *ἀπόπλον*, *ἐπίπλον* *ποιεῖσθαι* have been treated above, chaps. VII, XI and XII. *πρόνοιαν*, *φιλοτιμίαν* and *ἐπιμέλειαν* *ποιεῖσθαι*, which are closely related to *σπουδὴν* *ποιεῖσθαι*, prefer the imperfect. *ἔξοδον*, *ἐπάνοδον*, *ἔφοδον* *ποιεῖσθαι*, though related to *πορείαν* *ποιεῖσθαι*, are no less frequently used in the aorist than in the imperfect. Of the periphrases corresponding to *ἀναχωρεῖν*, *ἀποχωρεῖν* and *ὑποχωρεῖν*, the imperfect of *ἀποχώρησιν* *ποιεῖσθαι* is comparatively frequent, but forms of *ἀναχώρησιν* and *ὑποχώρησιν* *ποιεῖσθαι* are not common. The imperfect of *ποιεῖσθαι* τὴν ὁρμήν is the favorite tense, and possibly it occurs oftener than that of *ὁρμᾶν*. The periphrasis of itself expresses a certain amount of circumstantiality, and this explains why the aorist of the periphrastic expression is so much less

common than that of ὄρμᾶν, of which the aorist is almost the rule. The chapter closes with references to more than a score of characteristic imperfects of various other periphrases with ποιεῖσθαι expressing both military and non-military operations.

Chap. XIX. *συμβαίνειν with infinitive*.—A no less favorite periphrasis than ποιεῖσθαι with an accusative object is *συμβαίνειν* with the infinitive, which often degenerates into little more than a mere formula. The aorist of *συμβαίνειν*, as might be expected, is common enough, and the dependent infinitive is likewise commonly in the aorist, but the inf. of duration dependent on a συνέβη is not excluded. The imperfect of *συμβαίνειν* is also quite common. Duration, development, description underlie its use. Worthy of especial note are the combinations of *συμβαίνειν* with γίνεσθαι, εἶναι and ἵπάρχειν. εἶναι and ἵπάρχειν are found only with the present and imperfect of *συμβαίνειν*, but συνέβη γενέσθαι is no less frequent than *συμβαίνειν* and συνέβαινε γίνεσθαι. 26 instances of συνέβη γενέσθαι are cited, 17 instances of συνέβαινε γίνεσθαι, 7 of *συμβαίνειν* γίνεσθαι (including one ex. of leading verb in subj.), 6 of συνέβαινε εἶναι, 6 of εἶναι *συμβαίνειν*, and 4 of ἵπάρχειν *συμβαίνειν* or *συμβαίνειν* ἵπάρχειν (including one ex. of leading verb in subj.). The rule for the choice of tenses in case of the dependent infinitive is undoubtedly this, that with the present, imperfect and perfect of *συμβαίνειν* the infinitive present or perfect is used, and with the aorist of *συμβαίνειν* the aorist infinitive is used, but this rule, like other rules, has exceptions. The following is a synopsis of the use of the tenses of the dependent infinitive with the imperfect and aorist indicative of *συμβαίνειν*. συνέβαινε occurs with pres. inf. 37 times in the first three books and proportionately just as frequently in the remaining books; with the perfect inf. 23¹ times in all; with the aorist inf. 3 times in all. συνέβη is used with aorist inf. 44 times in first three books and proportionately as frequently thereafter; with the present infinitive 11 times (including one ex. of συνέβη καὶ συμβήσεται w. pres. inf.) in all; with perf. inf. 3 times in all. It remains to be noted that *συμπίπτειν* and *συγκυρεῖν* are occasionally used with the infinitive in the same sense as *συμβαίνειν* w. inf.

Chap. XX. *φέρειν* and compounds.—φέρω and its compounds seem to belong to the class of verbs whose durative forms outweigh in point of frequency the aoristic forms, for twice as many instances of the former as of the latter were noted. Only the strictly narrative forms, the imperfect and aorist indicative,

¹ In Abb. 3, p. 88, twenty-six instances, comprising 33 infinitives, are given.

can here be considered. Only two examples of the aorist of *φέρειν* were found, but quite a number of imperfects, and among them the imperfects of *δυσχερῶς* and *βαρίως φέρειν*, which were referred to above, chap. VI. For the compounds of *φέρειν* the imperfect is the rule, the aorist being far less common than might be supposed. *ἐκφέρειν* alone forms an exception and shows a number of aorists.

Chap. XXI. *βάλλειν* and compounds.—In the case of the verbs treated in this and some of the following chapters, the durative forms differ but slightly from the corresponding aoristic forms. In consequence of this similarity there was always more or less room for error on the part of the copyist. But the tradition of good, old MSS, in this respect, is much better than might have been supposed from otherwise corrupt passages found in them. Of course, it is possible to see how here and there an error may have crept in, but in the majority of cases the forms in question have been handed down correctly, as is shown by comparison with other passages that contain the same verb in the same form. For whereas it is quite likely that a single peculiar imperfect may inadvertently have supplanted an aorist, it is not probable that the same mistake could have been made in three or four, or even more, precisely similar and yet wholly disconnected passages, where the uniform tradition of the best MSS favors the imperfect. Of course, the important thing to do is to watch the author's use of the tenses. The greater the number of the examples and the more varied the instances that can be adduced of a construction that might otherwise appear strange, the more certainly it can be proved to be genuine and to the point. Furthermore, the usage of synonymous verbs is to be noted, verbs whose imperfects and aorists were never confounded in the MSS. So, for example, in the case of the form *συνέβαλλον*, which has been restored in a number of cases in the description of military engagements, those passages must be compared in which *συνεπλέκομην* is used in exactly the same way, and if upon the basis of these examples, one should feel tempted to pronounce in favor of the exclusive use of the imperfect of *συμβάλλειν* in descriptions of battles, it would only be necessary to call attention to the occurrence of *συνεπλέκησαν*, which surely could not have been mistaken for *συνεπλέκοντο*. Moreover, the most difficult uses of *ἐπιβάλλεσθαι* find their analogies in the use of *ἐγχειρέin*, *ἐπιχειρέin*, *ἐπιβολὰς ποιεῖσθαι* and similar expressions—expressions that were used in the sense

of *ἐπιβάλλεσθαι* with the inf. and whose narrative tenses could not possibly have been confounded. Even the knotty problem of determining whether after *τὸ μὲν πρῶτον* the imperfect or the aorist of *ἐπιβάλλεσθαι* is the correct tradition has been solved by the comparison of similar uses of other verbs.

The simple verb *βάλλειν* is very rarely used. No imperfect or aorist indicative active of *βάλλειν* occurs in Polybios. The middle is represented by only one aorist indicative and one aor. ptc. Of the compounds of *βάλλειν*, the aorist is as a rule far more common than the imperfect. The following is a summary of the details. *a)* Of *ἀποβάλλειν*, *προσαποβάλλειν*, *εἰσβάλλειν*, *καταβάλλειν*, *παρακαταβάλλειν*, *μεταβάλλειν*, *προβάλλεσθαι*, *ὑπερβάλλειν* (act.) and *συνυπερβάλλειν* the imperfect is not in use. As a matter of fact, the imperfect is occasionally met with in the MSS, but these instances have been changed to the aorist partly upon the basis of better MS authority and partly from internal evidence, and even if one or another instance of an *undoubted* imperfect should come to light, the rule would still hold good that the aorist is the regular narrative tense of this group of verbs. *b)* In comparison with the rare imperfect of *ἐκβάλλειν*, *ἐμβάλλειν*, *παρεμβάλλειν*, *ἐπιπαρεμβάλλειν*, *ἐπιβάλλειν* and *περιβάλλειν*, the aorist is quite frequent. *c)* The imperfect of *προσβάλλειν*, *συμβάλλειν*, *ὑποβάλλειν* is somewhat more frequent, though the aorist is the prevailing tense. *παραβάλλειν* forms a separate category in revealing a greater frequency of durative than of aoristic forms.¹

Chap. XXII. *ἐπιβάλλεσθαι* with the infinitive.—The aorist, even in the non-indicative moods, is the predominant tense of *ἐπιβάλλεσθαι*, but the tense of the dependent infinitive is the present, not the aorist. There are 72 absolutely certain instances of the aorist indicative of *ἐπιβάλλεσθαι* with dependent infinitive. In 10 of these examples the aorist infinitive is used, in 61 the present infinitive occurs, and once both aorist and present infinitive are used. This array of evidence for the use of the aorist indicative of *ἐπιβάλλεσθαι* is followed by a defence of the aorist in a number of

¹ The writer regrets that lack of space does not permit him to give more than the above summary of the details that cover 20 pages of H.'s treatise, and to afford an idea of the value of Hultsch's work for purposes of textual criticism, this opportunity is seized upon to state that within the 20 pages referred to, very nearly three dozen passages have been discussed in which the conjectures of others have been confirmed, original conjectures established, or the reading of one or more MSS defended against the reading of other and at times superior MSS.

passages in which either the testimony of the MSS fluctuates or the aorist has been introduced contrary to all MS authority, and in 4, 37, 5, where Hultsch formerly read ἐπεβάλλετο, he would now, in the light of a better understanding, return to the MS ἐπεβάλετο. A comparison of the use of the tenses of synonymous verbs, such as ἔγχειρεν, ἐπέχειρεν and τολμᾶν, furnishes another support for the prevalence of the aorist tense in the case of ἐπιβάλλεσθαι. In all those verbs there is a preponderance of the aorist, though their imperfects are comparatively more frequent than that of ἐπιβάλλεσθαι. This is accounted for by the slight difference of meaning. 'To take in hand,' 'to lay hold of,' 'to have the courage' are better adapted to the expression of duration than ἐπιβάλλεσθαι, *to undertake, resolve.* Note also the periphrasis τὴν ἐπιβολὴν ἔσχον. But 5, 62, 7 οὐδὲ ἐπιβολὴν εἶχον is found, and of ἐπιβολὴν ποιεῖσθαι there is only one aorist (an optative), over against several durative forms.

By the side of the large number of aorists of ἐπιβάλλεσθαι so few imperfects can be shown that one might feel tempted to make short mete of the matter, cut out the λ and thus reduce all such forms to the aorist. But it would be a serious mistake to do away with forms that are particularly appropriate in point of meaning and that are supported by the testimony of the MSS and by the analogy of other verbs. 6, 49, 7-9 may be mentioned as a particularly fine example of the imperfect of ἐπιβάλλεσθαι. The verb in question is frequently used in the first member of a period beginning with τὸ μὲν πρῶτον. To further show the peculiar fondness of ἐπιβάλλεσθαι for the aorist indicative, all the instances of τὸ μὲν πρῶτον periods are cited. These instances are separated into two classes, the first containing ἐπιβάλλεσθαι in the τὸ μὲν πρῶτον clause, the second containing some other verb. Each class is in turn subdivided according to the following three categories: 1. Impf. in first clause, aor. in second. 2. Aorist in both clauses. 3. Aor. in first clause and impf. in second, whilst for the second class a fourth category, "Imperfect in both clauses," becomes necessary. The comparison shows that though, as a general rule, the imperfect indicative is far more common than the aorist in the antecedent clause of periods beginning with τὸ μὲν πρῶτον, yet, when ἐπιβάλλεσθαι happens to be the verb, the aorist far outweighs the imperfect. The chapter closes with a list of all the passages containing any form of ἐπιβάλλεσθαι with infinitive, arranged with a view to showing the tense of the dependent infinitive. In dependence upon aoristic forms of ἐπιβάλλεσθαι were found 91

infinitive presents of 60 different verbs, and only 20 infinitive aorists of 17 different verbs; in dependence upon durative forms of *ἐπιβάλλεσθαι* was found only the present infinitive—12 instances belonging to 11 different verbs. A solitary instance of the perfect of *ἐπιβάλλεσθαι* with a present inf. ends the list. Among this large number of dependent infinitives there are only 5 verbs that are represented by both aorist and present infinitive.

Chap. XXIII. *γίνεσθαι* and compounds.—As in the case of the earlier historians, so in Polybios, the aorist is the regular narrative tense of *γίνεσθαι*.¹ Parallel with *ἔγενόμην*, Polybios uses the form *ἔγενήθην* without any essential difference of meaning. The imperfect of *γίνεσθαι* is very common in Polybios, and miscellaneous examples of the various categories of duration, evolution and description have been found. The expressions *ἴγινετο τι περὶ τινα* and *ἴγινετο τις περὶ τι, πρὸς τινι* or *πρὸς τι* are sufficiently important to require special treatment. *γίνεσθαι τι περὶ τινα* is a rare expression. Two imperfects, one present participle, one aorist indicative and one aor. ptc. are all the instances cited. The thought is more frequently expressed by the periphrases *συνέβαινε γίνεσθαι* and *συνέβη γενέσθαι*, of the latter of which there are quite a number of examples. Polybios is very fond of the expression *γίνεσθαι περὶ τι* "to be engaged at something, to be busy with." The expression is synonymous with *σπουδάζειν* and *σπουδῆν ποιεῖσθαι*, and, as with them, the imperfect is the customary narrative tense. About 50 examples of this tense are cited, while of the aorist, so far as known, there are only 4 examples in Polybios. Synonymous with *γίνεται περὶ τι* is *γίνεσθαι πρὸς τινι* or *πρὸς τι*, and of this expression 14 examples of the imperfect, with but a solitary instance of the aorist, are cited. Of the imperfect of the parallel expression *εἶναι πρὸς τινι* or *πρὸς τι*, only the form with *πρὸς τινι*² happens to occur in Polybios, and 8 instances are mentioned. The compounds of *γίνεσθαι* are of no special importance.

Chap. XXIV. *ἔχειν* and compounds.—Almost all the examples of the imperfect of *ἔχειν* express duration in the strict sense of the

¹ In Thuc. there are 59 imperfects to 234 aorists ind., and in Demosthenes 51 imperfects to 122 aorists ind.

² Hultsch, p. 358, N. 2, discusses the vexed question of the use of the dative and the accusative with *πρὸς* in connection with *εἶναι* or *γίνεσθαι*. He finds that of all the objects of *πρὸς*, when used in this combination, 8 are datives plural, 11 datives sing. and 12 acc. sing., there being no accusative plural. A most careful consideration of the facts seems to him to warrant no uniform rule as to the use of the case with *πρὸς*.

word. This use of *εἰχον* prevails almost exclusively in the following categories: *ἔχειν* with a personal object, especially with an object designating troops or divisions of troops; *ἔχειν* in the signification of "being an occupant of a country, a city or a place"; *ἐντολάς, ἔτη, ἡγεμονίαν ἔχειν; οὐκ, οὐδὲν ἔχειν; ᔾχειν* (intransitive) with adverbs; *ἔχεσθαι, ἀνέχεσθαι, ἀντέχεσθαι; ἀντέχειν, προσαντέχειν; ἀπέχειν* in the sense of local distance from; *ἐπέχειν* and *προσέχειν* "to pay attention to"; *παρέχειν* and *παρέχεσθαι; περιέχειν, προέχειν, συνέχειν, ὑπερέχειν.* The imperfect is freely used of *ἔχειν* w. *ἥσυχίαν, διάθεσιν, ἐλπίδας* and other objects, though the use of the aorist is not to be classed as exceptional. Both imperfect and aorist of *ἐπιβολήν, ὄρμὴν ἔχειν, ἀπέχεσθαι, κατέχειν* and *μετέχειν* are in frequent use. Only isolated examples occur of the imperfect of *τοσοῦτον ἀπέχειν* with infinitive and of *προσέχειν* "to enter port." Among the imperfects of the above-mentioned verbs and phrases there are a few that express description and there is a clear instance of a *κατέχον* expressing evolution.

As for the aorist, it remains to be said that it is not confined to certain meanings and combinations of *ἔχω* to the same extent as the imperfect. The aorist, it is true, is the regular tense of *τοσοῦτον ἀπέχειν* with inf., *ἐπέχειν* "to hold back, check oneself, break off a discourse," *κατέχειν* "to get into one's power, take possession of," and of *κατέχειν* and *προσέχειν* "to enter port." Furthermore, the aorist is not uncommon of certain periphrases expressing "to undertake, resolve," of *αἰτίαν συντέλειαν τέλος ἔχειν, ἀπέχεσθαι, παρακατέχειν* and *μετέχειν.* The deciding factor, however, is not the meaning of the verb, but the point of view that the narrator occupies in making his report.

Chap. XXV. *λείπειν* and compounds.—In the study of *λείπειν*, special difficulties arise. Whereas, in the case of the other verbs whose imperfect and aorist differ by only one letter, the MSS are for the most part trustworthy authority, they are very unsatisfactory in the case of *λείπειν*.¹ To be consistent with his usage in

¹ It is interesting to compare, in this connection, what Blass has to say on the subject in Rh. M. 44 (1889), p. 406: "Ganz im Gegenteil, wenn einmal die Handschriften eines Autors, was häufig genug vorkommt, zwischen *λαμβάνειν* und *λαβεῖν, λείπειν* und *λιπεῖν* schwanken: der Herausgeber wird meistens es bequemer und sicherer finden, die Handschriften entscheiden zu lassen als selbst die Verantwortung für eine Entscheidung zu übernehmen. Ich glaube nun wirklich, zumal bei *λείπειν* oder *λιπεῖν* bietet dies Verfahren keine grössere Sicherheit das Richtige zu treffen, als wenn jemand statt dessen Knöpfe zählen wollte."

the case of other verbs, Polybios cannot have used the aorist of *λείπειν* as rarely, or the imperfect as freely, as the MSS would indicate. The cause of the mistake is evident: *α* for *ε* is only one of the large number of errors due to iotaism. The question next arises as to where the hand of the critic is to stop. It is quite likely that a few imperfects of duration may have been unjustly banished from our editions. For in our search for the correct form we are confronted by another difficulty. In the case of other verbs, the study of the tenses of synonymous expressions proved a great help in solving the problem; but *λείπειν* and most of its compounds have no such close synonyms, and hence the choice between durative and aoristic forms of *λείπειν* must be determined without the aid derived from such sources. The method pursued has been to study the passive forms first, there being no possibility of confusion between imperfect and aorist here. The durative forms of the passive of *λείπω* are frequently used in the sense of "to be inferior to." The present is especially frequent in the sense of being worsted in battle, and is then practically a perfect, being equivalent to *ἡττᾶσθαι* as opposed to *υκάνειν*. Like the simple verb, *ἀπολείπεσθαι* and *ὑπολείπεσθαι* are used in the sense of "to be inferior to." But the durative forms of the compounds of *λείπεσθαι* are more frequently used in the sense of "*to remain, be left,*" and the perfect signification is quite marked in many examples, especially in the case of the articular participle. Durative forms of *παραλείπεσθαι* (*praetermitti, omitti*) also approach the signification of the perfect. Of course, in the case of all these verbs, actual perfect forms occur. As for the aorist, it may be said that fond as Polybios is of using the durative forms of *λείπεσθαι* and compounds, the aoristic forms are also used whenever occasion demands. Passing on to the tenses of the active voice of *λείπειν* and compounds, it is to be noted that the durative forms of the simple verb are found partly in the transitive sense of "leaving" and partly in the intransitive sense of "to fall short of." The participle is especially common. Of *ἀπολείπειν*, when used in combination with *οὐδέν* in the sense of '*leaving nothing undone*,' though there are one or two undoubted instances of the use of the aorist, yet the imperfect is the tense regularly used. But apart from this use of the imperfect of *ἀπολείπειν*, there are only a few other imperfects of the compounds of *λείπειν* about which there can be no doubt as to the correct tradition. In addition to these, however, the imperfect of *ἀπολείπειν*, *καταλείπειν*, *ἐγκαταλείπειν*,

λλείπειν and *παραλείπειν* is to be restored in a number of cases upon the testimony of the oldest MSS. Over against the above-mentioned examples of the imperfect of λείπειν and compounds there can be adduced only a comparatively few aorists of undoubted transmission. There are, however, a considerable number of passages in which Polybios in all probability used the aorist, while the tradition of the oldest MSS favors the durative forms. This happens very frequently in the case of the participle, and there the mistake can easily be rectified. In the next place, there are a number of passages in which all editors agree that the durative forms of ἀπολείπειν or καταλείπειν which, without any special reason, happen to be intermingled with parallel aorists must be changed. The analogy of these examples in turn necessitates the restoration of the aorist in a few other cases, and after the pattern of such expressions as *καθάπερ εἴπον*, *ὡς εἴπον*, etc., the aorist of ἀπολείπειν must undoubtedly be read in such examples as *ἀφ' ἡνῶ Τίμαος ἀπέλιπεν*. In a few instances one or more MSS present durative forms of ἐκλείπειν τὸν τόπον, τὴν πόλιν, τὸ ζῆν, whereas the aorist should be read, as is shown by such passages in which all the MSS agree upon the aorist; and in the case of ἐκλιπεῖν τὸ ζῆν the aorist is rendered still more certain by the analogy of the synonymous expression *τὸν βίον μεταλλάξαι*. There remain a few examples in which the aorist of *παραλείπειν* should be read in spite of MS authority for the durative forms.

Chap. XXVI. *μένειν* and compounds.—*μένειν* contains the notion of duration, and hence it is perfectly natural to find that the imperfect is the prevailing narrative tense in Polybios, though the aorist is not uncommon. There is quite a string of examples in which the imperfect of *μένω* is parallel with other imperfects. In other passages the durative signification of *ἔμενον* is heightened by an accessory participle of duration. The imperfect and durative forms in general are the rule in expressions signifying "to cling to a resolution, opinion," as e. g. in *ἐπὶ τοῦ καθήκοντος ἔμενε λογισμοῦ* 3. 85, 10. There are numerous examples of the imperfect of *μένω* in a *μέν* clause followed by the aorist of another verb in the corresponding *δέ* clause; the imperfect is that of evolution. Lastly, there are two examples of the imperfect of *μένω* that belong to none of the above classes. The imperfect is that of duration. The use of the imperfect of *μένειν* is to be compared with the use of the imperfect of the kindred verbs *διατρίβειν*, *ἐνδιατρίβειν*, *καρτερεῖν*, *προσκαρτερεῖν* and *ἀνέχεσθαι*. "Whilst in all the

examples thus far considered, the action of awaiting, expecting or abiding was conceived as extended in time, as still continuing and in touch with other actions, we now come to the instances in which the writer views the period of waiting as complexive (in sich zusammengedrängt) and has reported such waiting like other actions in such a way as to express the conclusion of the action (in abschliessender Form)." This aorist of *μένω* is not only found parallel with other aorists within the same period, but it also occurs in a simple sentence. It is also to be noted that even in the sense of "clinging to an opinion," there are instances of the use of the aorist of *μένω*. In not a few instances the aoristic forms of *μένω* and its compounds with *ἀνά*, *διά* and *ἐπί* seem to approach durative forms, but the period of waiting is represented as having come to a close. Noteworthy are two examples of the aorist of *μένειν* and *διαμένειν* connected by *kai* with a clause containing the imperfect of some other verb. This change is quite common in *μέν* and *δέ* clauses. The reverse change also takes place, and the aorist of *μένω* follows the imperfect of some other verb. Of the various compounds of *μένω*, *ὑπομένω* is of the most frequent occurrence. It is used transitively and intransitively, and both imperfect and aorist are used, though the imperfect is the more frequent of the two. The other compounds of *μένω* follow the analogy of *ὑπομένω* and the simple verb in the matter of the narrative tenses.

Chap. XXVII. *φεύγειν* and compounds.—This verb is most frequently found in Polybios in the description of battles, skirmishes or other military engagements. As the flight of one party or the other determines the issue of the battle, it is quite natural that the tense of final report should often be used, though this is not the rule. The imperfect is frequently used to express continuance and to describe.¹ When *φεύγειν* is used in the sense of "being exiled," the aorist is used to express the fact that a person fled from a city or country and went into exile, while the imperfect refers to the duration of the exile (Dauer des Aufenthaltes im Exile). Of the compounds of *φεύγειν*, *διαφεύγειν* expresses

¹ H. calls attention to an explanation given by him on p. 25 with reference to *ἔφενγον προτροπάδην* 5, 69, 9. His words are: "und so wird auch die Haupt-handlung *ἔφενγον προτροπάδην* als eine *im Verlaufe eines gewissen Zeitraumes* sich entwickelnde und insofern dauernde angesehen." The expression in italics (the italics are the reviewer's) certainly suggests that the idea of length of time enters into the explanation of the imperfect. That this is the wrong conception has been abundantly shown above. As for the theory of description, see p. 154, note 2.

that the flight is crowned with success, and hence the aorist is the regular narrative tense. No imperfects of this verb are found in Polybios, for in 38, 5, 6 διέφυγον should be read, after the analogy of all other passages.¹ καταφεύγειν is used in the imperfect and in other durative forms as well as in the aoristic forms.² Of προσφέγειν two aorists indicative are cited.

Chap. XXVIII. *The Aorist.*—The previous investigation has shown that the aorist, whether used of an action that occupied the briefest possible amount of time or of an action that extended over a longer period, whether used ingressively or to express completion,³ and whether this completion is specially emphasized or merely indicated by the context, is certainly the tense of *final report*. The following uses of the aorist may be mentioned by way of supplementing or recapitulating what has already been said. The aorist of πείθειν means *to persuade*, the imperfect expresses *the attempt to persuade*. The aorist is used with definite and indefinite expressions of time to show that the action extending over this period of time is regarded as fully settled (völlig erledigt), and that as in point of time, so in the order of narration, this action is followed by another action.⁴ The aorist

¹ The passage reads: διὸ καὶ πᾶσιν οὐχ οἷον δνειδος ἡκολούθει τῶν ἀκληριῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ τῆς ἀτυχίας δνομα διέφυγον. Hultsch states that the characters of the last word are somewhat effaced, so that it is impossible to determine the exact reading. In his edition he reads ἐφεγον, but would now read διέφυγον for the above-mentioned reason. Following Hultsch's readings in the rest of the passage, there seems to be no good reason why the impf. διέφενγον should not here be used as it is used in Thucydides.

² In Thucydides the imperfect indicative is not found, but the aorist ind. and other aoristic forms are common. Demosthenes furnishes an example of the imperfect ind.

³ Hultsch here uses the word *Vollendung*. It seems that at this point he has somewhat repented of his former view, with reference to which see p. 148 f.

⁴ H.'s words are: "Es wird dann ein gewisser, sei es nach Jahren, Monaten, Tagen, sei es durch ungefähre Zeitangaben abgegrenzter Zeitraum ins Auge gefasst und über eine diesen Zeitraum ausfüllende Handlung so berichtet, dass dieselbe als völlig erledigt gilt und anderes wie es tatsächlich jenes Frühere der Zeit nach ablöste, so auch in der Berichterstattung an den frei gewordenen Platz einrückt." "Dass dieselbe als völlig erledigt gilt" may be right or not, according to what is meant by these words; what follows, if it means anything, is positively wrong. There is a world of difference between actual occurrences and the narration of these occurrences. Actually, a number of dissimilar occurrences may go on contemporaneously, either partially or totally. In narration, only one predication can be made at the

is used when one expresses one's final opinion in regard to the merits of distinguished men. Characteristic is the use of the aorist of verbs like *ἀνέων*, *ἀποτελεῖν*, *ἐπιτελεῖν*, and with such expressions as *τέλος*, *πέρας*, *τὸ τελευταῖον*. When the imperfect of such verbs, or verbs accompanied by such expressions, is used, the notion of duration or of evolution is quite clear. Even in the few instances in which the notion of *ingress* is so sharp as to warrant the use of such a term as *ingressive* aorist, the notion of final report is maintained, and so we find that by the side of the imperfect of evolution of *ἀρχεσθαι* and similar expressions and the imperfect with *τὰς μὲν ἀρχὰς*, etc., the aorist (*zusammenfassend und abschliessend*) is not at all uncommon. The aorist may also be used to designate time antecedent to the past (*Vorvergangenheit*). This was observed long since by Apollonios. Only Apollonios errs in making this use dependent upon the express or implied use of *πάλαι* in combination with this tense. For *πάλαι* may be used just as well with the imperfect. It is more correct to say that the aorist may be considered a substitute for the pluperfect when the difference of time is expressly mentioned. There are other instances in which the antecedence is indicated by other temporal expressions or must be gathered from the context. In every instance, however, the writer views the action as concluded.¹ While a few of the long list of examples of the

same time. Hence it often happens that the narrator, after reporting one fact in the aorist, may be obliged to report, subsequently, one or more other facts terminating at the same time as the first or even previously to it. Comp. Polyb. 37, 10, 2 (cited by Hultsch): (*Μασσανάσσης*) *ἐβασίλευσεν ἐπη πλείω τῶν ἔξηκοντα* with what follows. It is this difference between the possibilities of actual occurrences and the possibilities of narration that lies at the bottom of so many of the difficulties attaching to the use and to the understanding of the tenses.

¹ In treating of the relations existing between the aorist and the pluperfect, Hultsch, at the very outset, renders himself liable to criticism by giving assent to the statement that the aorist may *express* time antecedent to the past (*Vorvergangenheit*), inasmuch as that use has been denied by some even to the pluperfect. Whenever the aorist is used where according to another idiom or from another point of view the pluperfect might have been used, the idea of past completion previous to some other past time is an inference and nothing else. When Hultsch says that it is more correct to say that the aorist may be counted a substitute for the pluperfect when the *difference of time* is expressly mentioned, the statement is misleading, to say the least. The fact of the matter is that when the difference of time is mentioned, the aorist or the imperfect, as the case may be, is far more natural and certainly logically more

apparent pluperfect use of the aorist are found in independent clauses, the majority of instances occur in subordinate clauses, principally relative and temporal, but it must be borne in mind that the use of the aorist in subordinate clauses differs in no respect from its use in principal clauses.¹ In temporal sentences the aorist indicative may designate repetition. The following examples have been noted: ὅσακις ἐτόλμησαν (1, 2, 2); ὅταν—ἐτράπησαν (4, 32, 6); ὅταν προσήρεισε (13, 7, 10), and ἐπειδὰν—ἀνέστησε (13, 7, 8).² Polybios' use of the so-called gnomic aorist is similar to that of Attic prose. G. Hermann (ad Vig., pp. 909 and 911; Opusc. II, p. 42) and F. Franke (Ber. d. k. sächs. Ges. d. Wissensch. 1854, p. 70 ff.) are right in considering this aorist a narrative tense by means of which the narrator states a single observation formerly made by him, and leaves it over to the reader to deduct his own generalizations therefrom. The examples from Polybios show the narrative character of the tense. The

correct than the pluperfect would be, though the pluperfect is by no means excluded in Polybios, as H. shows later on, 3. Abh., p. 77; nor is it excluded in the classical times. In Latin, on the contrary, the pluperfect seems to be the rule. This is true at least for Caesar, if the writer remembers rightly.

¹ Granting all this, yet there is more than one interesting point regarding the use of the tenses in subordinate indicative clauses which might well have found a place in such an elaborate treatise as Hultsch's. Certainly after making the statement (p. 454, bottom): "Auch in Nebensätzen, die durch *ἐτεῖ* eingeleitet werden, ist die durch den Aorist gegebene abgeschlossene Handlung *zumeist* [the italics are mine] auch der des Hauptsatzes vorangegangen," the author ought not to have denied us at least a few examples in which the aorist was used of non-antecedent action. Our grammars do not seem to furnish such examples.

² The statement that the aorist can be used in temporal sentences to express repetition is not well chosen. Not the aorist, but the accompanying qualifying temporal expression designates the repetition. Furthermore, when Hultsch cites, without a word of comment, such examples as the last three of the four examples above quoted, he is certainly guilty of an error of omission. He might have told us whether these and *ὅταν—ἥσαν* (4, 32, 5) are the only examples in Polybios of *ὅταν*, etc., with the indicative, as one would suppose from Stich, de Polybii dicendi genere, Act. Sem. Erl. II, p. 202; and though himself convinced of their genuineness, he might have told us upon what his convictions were based, seeing that Stich, l. c., refuses to take any notice of 13, 7, 8-10, on the ground of its being extremely doubtful, and that Reiske, apud Schweigh., Polyb. VII, p. 153, says of this corrupt passage: "sed quid frustra labore in emendando futili commento, non Polybii, (non potuerunt ab illo ingenio tam prodigiosae nugae proficiisci) sed graeculi alicujus, cuius anilem fabellam vel ipsa conturbata inficeta soloeca dictio prodit," and even 4, 32, 5 f. has been questioned by some. Cf. Poppo, Thuc. III 1, p. 313.

only point to be noted about Polybios' usage is the close connection of the aorist with presents that refer to established customs and institutions. All else that has been said by Kaelker, *Quaest. de eloc. Polyb.*, Leipz. Stud. III (1880), p. 267, and J. Stich, *de Polybii dicendi genere*, Act. Sem. Erl. II (1881), pp. 168 f. and 206, with reference to the use of the gnomic aorist in Polybios, especially the alleged "neglegentia" of our historian, according to which "nonnunquam imperfecta, aoristi, perfecta, plusquamperfecta fere nullo discrimin'e rerum adhibentur neque infinitivi aut participii tempora religiose distinguuntur" and "aoristo utitur Polybius primus vel solus de rebus praesentibus" (Stich, p. 206) shows a complete lack of appreciation of Polybian usage.¹ The aorist and perfect may under certain circumstances exchange places. There is no room for the perf. in strictly historical narrative. Its proper place is in speeches and excursions. It is here that Polybios at times follows up a perfect or a number of perfects by an aorist or *vice versa*. This change, which occurs sometimes within the limits of the same sentence, is not due to any carelessness or ignorance of the correct use of the tenses, but is employed by our author to enliven his discourse, each tense retaining its proper signification. The perfect is also used with reference to something that has been previously mentioned, as e. g. 3, 10, Ι καθάπερ ἐν ταῖς πρὸ ταύτης βύβλοις περὶ τούτων δεδηλώκαμεν. But more frequently the author is satisfied with the mere statement of a past fact, and uses the aorist, e. g. 4, 1, 1 ἐν μὲν τῇ πρὸ ταύτης βύβλῳ ἐδηλώσαμεν. This variation, and especially the change from perf. to aor. and aor. to perf. in 3, 1, 1. 2. 8 δεδηλώκαμεν, διεσαφήσαμεν, δεδηλώκαμεν, caused Stich, l. c., p. 170, to formulate the statement: "ita frequentat perfectum Polybius, ut proxime accedat ad vim aoristi." This statement, however, is not meant to be as sweeping as it seems, but is intended to apply only to the speeches and to the references to former statements, and Schmid's remark in *Atticismus*, II, p. 52,² must be modified

¹ Hultsch expressly states that he cannot sanction E. Moller's theory of the gnomic aorist. We regret that lack of space prevents us from entering into a discussion of this interesting question. We cannot, however, refrain from giving the references to the passages cited by Hultsch as affording instances of the use of the gnomic aorist. They are: 1, 81, 6-9; 12, 4, 13 f.; 6, 19, 5-9; 6, 9, 3; 21, 6; 23, 1; 24, 1-6; 25, 1; 26, 1. 9. 10; 33, 3. 6; 34, 9; 41, 2. 6. 8; 8, 6, 4.

² Hultsch seems to be somewhat too charitable to Stich, but when Schmid, l. c., says: "*Den Fehler* [the italics are the writer's] mancher späteren Schrift-

accordingly. The fact of the matter is that this change from aorist to perfect and *vice versa* is not an innovation of Polybios', but is found in Attic writers, and it would be wrong to say that Polybios used the tenses in such cases without any difference of meaning. In the actual narration of past events—that is to say in the vast bulk of Polybios—the perfect ind. is never used for the aorist indicative, and even the perf. ptc., where it seems to approach the aorist, has not lost its peculiar signification.

Chaps. XXIX and XXX. *Shifting* of Imperfect and Aorist.—As a treatment of the shifting of all the narrative tenses would have transcended the limits of any ordinary treatise, the present chapters are limited to the change from Imperfect to Aorist and *vice versa*, and even with this restriction it has been found necessary to limit the treatment to arranging and commenting upon the most important examples treated elsewhere in this work, and to supplementing them by other striking passages. In the former chapter the change from imperfect to aorist is discussed, and in the latter the change from aorist to imperfect. In the arrangement of the materials, the long passages in which there are repeated changes of tense are treated first. Prominently among these figures the description of the battle of Cannae 3, 113–116, where the choice of the tenses, among other things, affords evidence of the elaborate care that Polybios bestowed upon the elaboration of the minutest details, so much so that the passage in question may be called a veritable masterpiece of style. The examples in which the change of tenses is confined to the limits of a single sentence are grouped according to the conjunctions connecting the clauses containing the tenses in question. The instances in which *kai* is the connecting particle first receive attention. Hereupon follow the sentences in which the clauses are contrasted by *μέν* and *δέ* or such in which there is a *δέ* clause without preceding *μέν*. Lastly, sentences with members connected by various other co-ordinating particles come up for consideration. The examples of the second group exceed those of the first both in point of frequency and in point of variety of verbs used.¹

steller (bei Attikern sehr vereinzelt, hie u. da bei Polyb.: Stich, Acta Sem. Erl. II 170) das Perfektum anstatt des Aorists zu gebrauchen," etc., it is perfectly evident that Stich is wholly irresponsible for such phraseology as 'Fehler,' especially when applied to Attic writers.

¹ I count 54 passages in which the imperfect is followed by the aorist and 89 in which the aorist is followed by the imperfect with the connecting particle *kai*; 130 passages in which the imperfect is followed by the aorist, and 116 of

Another point of interest is the fact that the change of tenses, when studied as a whole, affords additional proof of the tendency of certain verbs or classes of verbs to prefer certain tenses.

Chap. XXXI. *Historical Present*.—The historical present is not very frequent in Polybius. It is found in book I 19 times; book II, 4 times; book III, 13 times; book IV, 10 times; book V, 10 times; remaining books (excluding book XL), 31 times. When J. Stich, l. c., p. 163, writes: "frequentissimus est autem usus praesentis, quod historicum vocant grammatici," and cites four examples in all, he affords but one of the many proofs of the haste and lack of reliability that characterize his work. In the first book there are about 1200 imperfects and aorists indic. against 19 historical presents. So it would be impossible even here to speak of an *usus frequentissimus*, not to say anything of the remaining books, in which the proportion of historical presents is still smaller. The 87 historical presents in books 1-39 belong to about 44 different verbs. Of these presents 43 must be regarded as representatives of the aorist, 33¹ are used in the sense of the imperfect, and of 11 it is uncertain whether they represent the aorist or the imperfect. It is further to be noted that the historical present is nowhere repeated a number of times within the same portion of narrative. Even the succession of two such presents is exceptional, being found in 1, 9, 2 f.; 55, 6; 10, 32, 4; 14, 4, 10 and fr. 81. Elsewhere this tense is found singly

the reverse with the clauses connected by $\mu\acute{e}v-\delta\acute{e}$. The explanation of the figures seems to be evident. The contrast involved in $\mu\acute{e}v-\delta\acute{e}$ is not at all unfavorable to the shifting of the tenses, while copulative *kai* acts rather as a barrier. So much so is this true of *kai* that instances of a change from imperfect to aorist are considerably less common than those of the more easy change from aorist to imperfect, and the use of the imperfect in the former case is limited almost exclusively to such verbs as are by preference used in the imperf. As for the latter case—the shift from aorist to imperfect of verbs connected by *kai*—that is often important from a stylistic rather than from a grammatical point of view, it being possible in such cases to replace the first of the two co-ordinate clauses by an aor. ptc. or by a subordinate clause introduced by *ēpeuðy*.

¹ Hultsch gives the number 34. He has had the misfortune to place *διαπέμπεται* (8, 18, 1) both among the representatives of the imperfect and among those presents in the case of which there may be some doubt as to whether they represent the imperfect or the aorist, and this slip has been made not only in the table on p. 60, but also in the separate discussion of the passage on p. 51.

and intermingled with other narrative tenses. As for the use, it is to be remarked that the historical present is especially used to introduce the reader into a new situation—to shift the scene of the drama, as it were. Hence we find distinct sections of historical narrative introduced in a vivid manner by this tense, and it is immaterial whether in this case the present is used for an aorist or for an imperfect.¹

Chap. XXXII. *Pluperfect*.—Polybios uses the pluperfect in exactly the same way as the former historians, though it would have to be ascertained by a separate investigation as to whether he uses it somewhat more freely than the Attic writers. The participle of the perfect would also have to be taken into account in this connection. For when it is used in connection with a narrative tense, it designates an action completed in the past (*die in der Vergangenheit vollendete Handlung*), and is therefore equivalent to a pluperfect in a subordinate clause. As far as our observations go, the perfect participle is a favorite form in

¹ This latter statement was quite timely. Hultsch has made entirely too much ado about the tense, whether imperfect or aorist, whose place the present is supposed to take. It is enough to know that at times the historical present may be replaced by the imperfect and at times by the aorist indicative without doing violence to the Greek idiom. As for the feeling of the tense, that is totally distinct from the feeling of either the imperfect or the aorist. In the theory of the tense, Hultsch (3. Abh., p. 43, foot-note) follows Kohlmann and Brugmann in believing that the speaker, when using the historical present, transfers himself to the time when the action took place and views the event as in a drama or in a picture. The commonly accepted view, and one that is advocated by Kühner, Krüger and Koch, is that the speaker views the past as present. Hultsch remarks that ultimately there is no great difference between the two views, and that may be true. It all depends on what is meant by viewing the past as present. But it does seem as though the former view got a little nearer to the real facts of the case. Only, the writer should like to add that the function of a tense used in historical narrative should be largely measured by the effect produced upon the hearer, and that the power of transferring the hearer to the past is a quality possessed not simply by the historical present, but by historical narrative in general; that is to say, by a narrative that is really a narrative and not simply a collection of statistics. The true *ἡθος* of the historical present must be sought elsewhere, probably in the direction pointed out by Prof. Gildersleeve, Pind., p. cii, and regarding its occurrence in history, it must be noted that Hultsch in so far agrees with Rodemeyer (*Das Praesens historicum bei Herodot und Thukydides*, Basel, 1889; Leipzig, 1889) as to admit that at least one use of the historical present is that it forms the basis or point of departure for a narrative of greater or less length.

Polybios, and it is probably also used where Attic writers would have been content with the aorist. This would amount to a gradual encroachment of the pluperfect in subordinate sentences at the expense of the aorist. The pluperfect of verbs whose perfect is equivalent to a present is found in quite a number of instances. *εἰστήκει* and compounds, *κατεπέπληκτο* (= ἐκπλαγῆς ἦν), *ἐπέπειστο*, *εἴθιστο* and *εἴώθει*, and *ἔθεδει* deserve especial mention. Of other pluperfектs, those of *ποιεῖσθαι* (mid.), and those of *γίνεσθαι*, *λαμβάνειν*, *πίπτειν*, *τάττειν*, *τιθέναι* and compounds, are especially frequent. In most of these cases, however, the pluperfect is used of a past state of completion, though the idea of antecedence is often very strongly suggested. But in quite a large number of cases the notion of an action antecedent to some other past action is definitely expressed or is forced upon us by the context. This use of the pluperfect is a favorite one in *γάρ* clauses and in relative sentences, particularly the latter. In other subordinate clauses the pluperfect is less common, only five examples being cited. The close relationship of imperfect and pluperfect is shown by the fact that imperfect and pluperfect are very frequently associated with one another, most commonly when connected by *μέν*—*δέ*, less frequently when connected by *καὶ*, and least frequently when connected by *καὶ*—*καὶ*, *τε*, *τε*—*τε*, *πρῶτον μέν*—*εἴτα*, *δέ* and *οὐ μάον*—*ἄλλὰ καὶ*. The shift from aorist to pluperfect or *vice versa* also occurs, but very much less frequently. Here again the majority of examples are found in clauses connected (contrasted) by means of *μέν* and *δέ*. The pluperfect is also found in the apodosis of a conditional sentence. Five examples are cited. A favorite periphrasis of the pluperfect is *συνέβαινε* (26 times) with the perfect inf. (33 times) and *συνέβη* (3 times) with perf. inf. (4 times) (cf. p. 168). Even *συμβεβήκει* occurs 7, 3, 6 (with perfect infinitive followed by aorist inf.); 31, 7, 13 (with perfect infinitive); 3, 103, 4 (without inf.). Another not uncommon periphrasis of the pluperfect is the use of the perfect participle with the aorist or the imperfect of *τυγχάνειν*. As in the case of *συμβαινειν* with the perf. inf., the imperfect is the rule for *τυγχάνειν* w. the perf. ptc., the aorist the exception. There are in all 293 pluperfects in Polybios, 21 being passive periphrastic forms consisting of *ἦν* and the perf. pass. ptc. A properly arranged list of all these pluperfects closes the chapter.

Conclusion.

At the close of this report of the facts of Polybian usage, the writer of this article would state that he has discussed in foot-notes only some of the many points that seemed to require a word of comment. He regrets very much that lack of space and time alike precluded any attempt at doing more. But, after all, the main object of this paper has been accomplished. Hultsch's elaborate treatise has received a portion at least of the attention it justly deserves. It is true, Hultsch has not been very successful in the treatment of the theoretical side of his subject. We find him dallying with theories and formulae that ought to be dead and buried, and when he does embrace more modern formulae, we are horrified to see that they are—ambiguous. But the subject is a very evasive one. Some of the best scholars have been deluded by its snares and will continue to be deluded, unless methods of investigation different from those in common vogue shall be pursued. What is needed in the first place is a broader study of the possibilities of Greek tense-usage by comparison with other languages, particularly the mother-tongue, and by that we mean more than simply defining a tense on the basis of a possible translation, or concluding that two tenses are practical equivalents if the same translation happens to make good sense in either case. Too much of this has been done heretofore, to the neglect of the larger study of the principles upon which the tense-usage of any particular language rests, and hence the study of the tenses has often remained but a comparatively fruitless attempt. The next step to take is to engage in a most minute and exhaustive study of the facts of the use of the tenses in Greek. It is in this respect that Hultsch's work has been of inestimable service. Though not absolutely exhaustive on all points, it has nevertheless been conducted on a vastly more generous scale than more pretentious treatises, and though his theoretical reasonings and the inferences he draws from his statistics are in a large measure unsound, nevertheless the valuable addition made by Hultsch to our knowledge of the facts of the language will more than compensate for his shortcomings in other directions.

C. W. E. MILLER.

II.—DIMINUTIVES IN CATULLUS.

As is well known, a marked feature of Catullus' style is his frequent use of diminutive forms both of nouns and adjectives. It is of course impossible in all cases to determine from external evidence whether there was given to any such form in a particular case, a true diminutive idea, or in fact an idea differing at all from that of the ordinary word. It is the purpose of this paper to discuss each diminutive form, to ascertain, if possible, its probable value, and to see what conclusions can be drawn therefrom concerning Catullus' usage.

I. Adjectives. (a) Those found elsewhere.

(b) ἄπαξ λεγόμενα.

II. Nouns. (a) Those found elsewhere.

(b) ἄπαξ λεγόμενα.

I (a).

1) *albulus*.

29. 8 Et ille nunc superbus et superfluens
Perambulabit omnium cubilia
Ut albulus columbus aut Adoneus.

In 68. 125 Cat. writes *niveus columbus*. *Albulus* is used in Mart. 12. 99. 4 with *freta* and in Varro r. r. 3. 14. 4 with *cochleae*. There is no reason in the context for supposing that Cat. intended any difference between *albulus* and *niveus* as applied to a dove, and to translate the first 'a whitish dove' would be thoroughly unpoetical. *Albus* is used for the pallor caused by fear or excess often enough, and if Cat., in applying the epithet to the dove, was influenced by the looks of Caesar, surely no dim. was wanted. It is highly improbable that there is any difference in meaning between *albulus columbus*, *albula freta* and *albus columbus*, *alba freta*. *Albus* is used three times in Cat. with *homo*, *parthenice* and *aether*, where certainly no more perfect whiteness is meant than in this case.

2) *aureolus*.

2. 12 Tam gratumst mihi quam ferunt puellae
Pernici aureolum fuisse malum.

61. 163 Transfer omine cum bono Limen aureolos pedes.

Aureus occurs four times in Cat. The dim. is used by Plautus, Lucilius, Varro, Cicero and Martial; in most cases in the same sense as *aureus*. In the first of these two instances from Cat. there can be no possible difference in meaning between the dim. and *aureus*. In the second, an idea of endearment may be read into the adjective.

3) *bimulus*.

17. 13 Nec sapit pueri instar
Bimuli tremula patris dormientis in ulna.

The only other quotable case of this dim. is from Suet. Cal. 8. There can be no real difference between *bimus* and *bimulus* here, unless perhaps we translate 'hardly two years old,' giving an additional idea of youth and contempt. This, however, is one of the more doubtful cases.

4) *frigidulus*.

64. 131 Atque haec extremis maestam dixisse querellis,
Frigidulos udo singultus ore cidentem.

Ariadne stands on the shore, looking out over the sea, having been abandoned by Theseus. *Frigidulos singultus* evidently means faint sobs—sobs made faint by the chill of fear and despair that has crept over the woman. Is there any difference between this and *frigidos singultus*? Cat. uses *frigidus* twice: 44. 13 me gravido frigida et frequens tussis Quassavit and 68. 29 frigida deserto tepefactet membra cubili. *Frigidulus* occurs twice in the Ciris: 250 frigidulam puellam and 348 morientis alumnae frigidulos ocellos. Evidently *frigidulus* in this passage in Cat. has a different meaning from that which it has in either of the places in the Ciris. *Frividus* occurs several times in meanings akin to this, but *frigidos* could not be written in hexameter verse. Hence Cat. used the dim. form with no probable dim. meaning, but for other reasons.

5) *integellus*.

15. 4 Ut, si quicquam animo tuo cupisti,
Quod castum expeteres et integellum.

Harpers' Lexicon translates "pretty safe, tolerably uninjured," which is wholly wrong. The context shows that the boy in question is to be kept free from the lust of Aurelius, and hence

is to be wholly uninjured. There could be no intermediate degree. If any difference exists between this form and *integer* in this passage, it would be in the strengthened idea of security. But there is no reason for supposing any real difference in meaning between them. Cat. uses *integer* three times of boys and girls in just this sense. In the only other place in Latin where this dim. occurs (Cic. ad Fam. 9. 10. 2) it is likewise precisely equivalent to *integer*. Any implied idea of affection seems forced, as far as this adjective is concerned.

6) *lacteolus*. 55. 17 Num te lacteolae tenent puellae?

This adj. occurs once in Aus. Ep. 7. 46 with *viscus* = caro candida, once in Prud. *oreph.* 11. 245 with *agni*, and ib. 3. 165 with *spiritus Eulaliae*. *Lacteus* is not used by Cat., but is by Vergil with *cervix*, *calla*, etc. In this passage we may well give to the dim. a sense differing somewhat from *lacteus*, but it will be in no way a primary diminutive idea. Rather will it imply an unusual degree of whiteness and beauty.

7) *languidulus*.

64. 331 Quae tibi flexanimo mentem perfundat amore
Languidulosque paret tecum coniungere somnos.

This adj. is quoted by Quint. 8. 3. 66 from Cicero with *coronae*, meaning drooping, and with *oculi* in Anthol. Lat. 33. 2 (621. 3). For its use in these three places any number of analogous uses of *languidus* can be quoted, and from the context here it does not seem probable that Cat. intended to make any difference in the meaning of *languidulus* and *languidus*. *Languidos* could not be used in a hexameter verse. Elsewhere Cat. uses *languidus*.

8) *misellus*.

35. 14 ex eo misellae Ignes interiorem edunt medullam
40. 1 miselle Ravide,
45. 21 Unam Septumius misellus Acmen Mavolt
80. 7 clamant Victoris rupta miselli Ilia.

The dim. occurs perhaps half a dozen times outside of Catullus. Cat. uses *miser* more frequently, and a comparison of the passages seems to show that there is probably no real difference in meaning between the two. There is at least no reason why these four cases should have the dim. and the others not, if there is any

difference of any sort between them. We may say, of course, that *misellus* conveys a stronger idea of wretchedness or contempt than *miser*, but there is nothing in these lines to prove it.

9) *molliculus*.

16. 4 Qui me ex versiculis meis putastis
 Quod sunt molliculi parum pudicum.
 16. 8 Si sunt molliculi ac parum pudici (versiculi).

This dim. occurs twice in Plautus with *escae* and *caseus*, and once in Charisius with *adulescentulus*. Cat. uses *mollis* more than twenty times, but nowhere with *versus*, nor in relation to poetry. The dim. form here would seem to be due mainly to the influence of *versiculus*, which precedes it in both cases, and to the assonance of the line rather than to any intended variation on the meaning of *mollis*.

10) *pallidulus*.

65. 6 Namque mei nuper Lethaeo gurgite fratri
 Pallidulam manans adluit unda pedem.

This word occurs once in Juvenal 10. 82, applied to Brutidius Niger. Cat. uses the comparative of *pallidus* once, 81. 4 *pallidior inaurata statua*. *Pallidus* means 'having a death-like appearance' very often, if not usually, and it is very difficult to see any variation from this meaning in *pallidulus* here. The only way to get any additional notion into the dim. is to assign to it an idea of pity, but that seems far-fetched.

11) *parvolus*.

61. 212 Torquatus volo parvolus Matris e gremio suo . . .

Cat. uses *parvus* three times. In other writers the dim. form had come to be used as exactly equivalent to *parvus*, and there is no apparent reason for making any distinction here.

12) *pusillus*. 37. 16 omnes pusilli; 54. 1 caput pusillum.

Only one case of *pusus* can be quoted, and *pusillus* was ordinarily used, having lost all distinctively dim. value.

13) *tenellulus*. 17. 15 et puella tenellulo delicatior haedo.

This double dim. can be quoted only once elsewhere (Laer. ap. Prisc. 903). Cat. uses *tener* eleven times. Here again the Lexi-

con's rendering "somewhat tender" is manifestly wrong, for if there is any force whatever in the variation in form to affect the meaning, it must be, judging from the context, to increase that meaning. *Tenellulus* must mean 'very delicate or tender,' if it means anything besides 'tender.' Undoubtedly it does mean 'very tender' here, to enhance the force of the compliment.

14) *turgidulus*.

3. 18 Tua nunc opera meae puellae
Flendo turgiduli rubent ocelli.

The only other quotable case of this dim. is from Paul. Petr. 5. 450, and this is of little value because of its lateness. Cat. does not have *turgidus* at all. The dim. would seem to be due to the influence of *puellae* and *ocelli*, and the desire on the part of the writer to produce an affectionate effect from the sound of the two lines. There is no dim. idea here in the adj. *turgidulus* itself, and assonance probably had more to do with its use than any variation in meaning between it and *turgidus*.

15) *turpiculus*. 41. 3 ista turpiculo puella naso.

This dim. occurs with *res* in Varro l. l. 7. 97, and in a metaphorical sense in Cicero de Orat. 2. 61. 248. Cat. uses *turpis* six times, but undoubtedly we can see here a distinctly contemptuous notion in the dim.

16) *Vetulus*. 27. 1 Minister vetuli puer Falerni.

Cat. uses *vetus* frequently. *Vetulus* occurs in other writers with no different meaning from *vetus*, and certainly there is no reason for making such difference here.

I (b). ἀπαξ λεγόμενα.

1) *aridulus*.

64. 316 Laneaque aridulis haerebant morsa labellis.

Aridus occurs three times in Cat. Here again the Lexicon's rendering "somewhat dry" is wrong. There is no probability whatever of the dim. expressing a less degree of dryness than *aridus*. Whatever idea it may convey, it certainly is not that. There is no reason in the context for any but the simple meaning of *aridus*, but *aridis* could not be used in the verse. Assonance and metre are probably responsible for *aridulis*.

2) *eruditulus*.

57. 7 Morbosi pariter, gemelli utrique
Uno in lectulo, erudituli ambo.

Cat. does not use *eruditus*. The statement in the Lexicon that this dim. means "somewhat skilled (in love)" cannot be true. If the adj. is applied to Mamurra and Caesar, in relation to their love-affairs, the dim. must imply something more than *eruditus* rather than less. This is evident from the context. The probable explanation is that both men might lay claim to the title of *eruditus* on ordinary grounds, and that Cat. coins a dim. to ridicule them by transferring the application of the adjective from literature to disgraceful love-affairs. The dim. idea then would be found in the object of their knowledge, not its amount. According to Catullus' own poem, they were both thoroughly well versed in all the arts of disgraceful love, and he desires to express contempt for their kind of learning.

This dim., then, possesses a real force in its meaning.

3) *floridulus*.

61. 189 Uxor in thalamo tibist
Ore floridulo nitens.

The simple form occurs four times, with *ver*, *corolla*, *ramulus* and *puellula*, twice in this same poem. Here too the Lexicon's rendering "somewhat blooming" is ridiculous, for under the circumstances the bloom on the bride's face would be intensified rather than diminished. There is therefore no primary dim. significance in this form. Some idea of endearment may be involved, but it is doubtful if *floridulus* differs here from *floridus*. If the dim. has any force it must be intensive, like *tenellulus*.

4) *imulus*.

25. 2 Cinaede Thalle mollior cuniculi capillo
Vel anseris medullula vel imula oricilla.

Imus does not occur in Cat., and *infimus* only once. There is evidently no difference in meaning between *imus* and *imulus*, and there is not much doubt but that its use and perhaps coinage was brought about by the influence of the other diminutives in these two lines and the assonance produced by the constantly recurring /-sound.

5) *lassulus*.

65. 35 Itaque ut domum Cybebes tetigere lassulae
Nimio e labore somnum capiunt sine Cerere.

Lassus occurs three times. Once more the Lexicon's translation "somewhat wearied" is wrong, for the context shows that a considerable amount of weariness is meant. None of the ordinary significations of the dim. seem to be in place here, and hence we conclude that none such is probably intended.

6) *mollicellus*.

25. 10 Ne laneum latusculum manusque mollicellas
Inusta turpiter tibi flagella conscribillent.

As this form is an $\ddot{\alpha}\pi.$ $\lambda\epsilon\gamma.$ beside *molliculus*, and as the context seems to require it, an additional idea of contempt is to be assigned to this dim.

7) *perlucidulus*. 69. 4 Aut perluciduli deliciis lapidis.

Perlucidus does not occur in Cat. This dim. cannot express any less of the quality described—if anything, quite the contrary. There may possibly be some allusion to the costliness of the stone, but, on the whole, the impression made by the passage is that there is no perceptible difference in meaning between the dim. and *perlucidus*.

8) *uvidulus*.

66. 63 Uvidulam a fletu cedentem ad tempa deum me
Sidus in antiquis diva novom posuit.

Cat. does not use *uvidus*. Here at least is a dim. in which we can see a very decided gain in meaning. The picture is that of Ariadne. She has been weeping sorely, and the dim. of the adj. calls especial attention to the wretchedness of the woman in the midst of her tears.

Lock? ?
Bernice !

In 15 cases, then—*albulus*, *aureolus* (1), *frigidulus*, *languidulus*, *misellus*, *molliculus*, *pallidulus*, *parvolus*, *pusillus*, *turgidulus*, *vetulus*, *aridulus*, *imulus*, *lassulus*, *perlucidulus*—the dim. form seems to convey no variation in meaning.

In 2 cases—*lacteolus*, *tenellulus*—there seems to be a distinct intensive idea.

In 3 cases—*turpiculus*, *eruditulus*, *mollicellus*—the dim. adds a stronger notion of contempt, and in one—*uvidulus*—of wretchedness.

3 cases—*bimulus*, *integellus*, *floridulus*—seem very doubtful: no strong evidence either way.

Compare now the substantives.

II. (a) Those found elsewhere.

(b) ἄπαξ λεγόμενα.

II (a).

1) *amiculus*.

30. 2 Alfene immemor atque unanimis false sodalibus
Iam te nil miseret, dure, tui dulcis amiculi?

As Cat. regularly uses *amicus* (15 times), there is no reason for refusing *amiculus* a true dim. sense, especially as the context and the use of the word elsewhere seem to require it. The dim. idea here is one of pity.

2) *articulus*. 99. 8. Too common to need comment.

3) *auricula*.

57. 44 ut pote quaē mi
Speraret nec linguam esse nec auriculam.

This dim. occurs frequently, often in the sense of the outer ear. Cat. uses *auris* several times, and no distinction in meaning seems to obtain in his use of the two forms.

4) *brachiolum*.

61. 177 Mitte brachiolum teres,
Praetextate, puellae.

Cat. uses *brachium* three times, and here there is very plainly a primary dim. meaning given to *brachiolum*, besides the notion of softness and beauty. The word is found only here in this sense. In Vegetius it is the name of a muscle in the horse.

5) *capsula*. 68. 36 Huc una ex multis capsula me sequitur.

Cat. does not use *capsa*. *Capsula* is found in Fab. Pictor, Pliny, Seneca, etc., and seems to have had regularly a proper dim. meaning.

6) *catulus*. 42. 9 Ridentem catuli ore Gallicani.

The ordinary word with true dim. meaning. *Catus* is extremely rare.

7) *codicilli.* 42. 11, 12, 19, 20, 24.

Very common in this sense. Originally a true dim., but probably that had been lost sight of.

8) *corolla.*

63. 66 Mihi floridis corollis redimita domus erat.

64. 283 Hos indistinctis plexos tulit ipse corollis
Quo permulsa domus iocundo risit odore.

Cat. uses *corona* twice. *Corolla* is found in Plautus, Prop. Petr., and Pliny (21. 2. 3) says that it was applied to a particular sort of garland, first on account of its lightness. Hence it had its true dim. value, and is probably so used in these two places.

9) *flagellum.*

25. 11 Ne laneum latusculum manusque mollicellas
Inusta turpiter tibi flagella conscribillent

62. 52 Iam iam te contingit summum radice flagellum,

This word, originally having a true dim. meaning, is quite common, while *flagrum* itself is rare. In the derived meaning which it has in the second passage, it is also not uncommon in writers on horticulture. It is probable that by Catullus' time all diminutive meaning had been lost sight of.

10) *flosculus.* 24. 1 O qui flosculus es Iuventiorum.

This dim. in this metaphorical sense is used by several writers. Cat. uses *flos* five times—twice in just this sense: 63. 64 ego gymnasi fui flos, 100. 2 Flos Veronensem depereunt iuvenum. One hardly sees why the dim. here should have any different a meaning from *flos* in the two cases just quoted. There is no particular affection expressed.

11) *furcilla.* 105. 2 Musae furcillis praecipitem eiciunt.

This is a sort of a proverb to express forcible expulsion; cf. Cic. ad Att. 16. 2. 4 quoniam furcilla extrudimur, Brundisium cogito, and Hor. Ep. 1. 10. 24 Naturam expellas furca, tamen usque recurrit. It is quite evident, therefore, that there is no difference in meaning between the two forms.

12) *gemellus.*

4. 27 Gemelle Castor et gemelle Castoris

57. 6 Morbosi pariter, gemelli utriusque.

This dim. is common enough in poetry. Cat. also uses *geminus*. In the second of these two passages the dim. may perhaps be regarded as conveying an idea of contempt, but in the first it means precisely the same as *geminus*.

13) *hortulus*.

61. 88 Talis in vario solet
 Divitis domini hortulo
 Stare flos hyacinthinus.

This is a rare word. Juvenal 3. 226 uses it in a true dim. sense; Pliny 35. 105 *suburbano hortulo hoc est Demetrii castris*, where a dim. sense is doubtful; Columella makes use of it to designate a part of a vineyard; Cicero uses it for 'garden-grounds.' where it appears to have lost its dim. signification, and once with a derived meaning in N. D. 1. 43. 120. Cat. uses *hortus* once. In the present passage an idea of smallness would seem out of place, and it is not easy to see that any other of the usual dim. ideas is particularly in place. Probably there is here no distinction in meaning.

14) *labellum*. 8. 18, 61. 216, 63. 74, 64. 104. 316, 80. 1, 99. 7.

Cat. uses *labrum* only once, and it is plain that a dim. of this word would be most suitable to express endearment and affection.

15) *lacrimula*.

66. 16 anne parentum
 Frustrantur falsis gaudia lacrimulis.

In the three cases where this dim. occurs (Ter. Eun. 1. 1. 22 and Cic. Planc. 31. 76) it means a 'crocodile tear,' easily derivable from the first dim. meaning. Doubtless the proper dim. idea had vanished.

16) *lapillus*.

23. 21 Nec toto decies cacas in anno
 Atque id durius est faba et lapillis.

In this nauseating passage it is probable that attention is directed to the small size.

17) *latusculum*.

25. 10 Ne laneum latusculum manusque mollicellas
 Inusta turpiter tibi flagella conscribillent.

This word occurs once elsewhere, in *Lucr.* 4. 305 *latuscula speculorum*. Here it has a decidedly contemptuous and derisive meaning, for which both lines are remarkable.

18) *lectulus*.

57. 7 Morbosi pariter, gemelli utrique
Uno in lectulo, erudituli ambo
64. 88 quam suavis expirans castus odores
Lectulus in molli complexu matris alebat

Lectulus is of course a common word, and in many cases in other writers it appears to mean precisely the same as *lectus*. Cat. uses *lectus* five times. In the first of these two passages it is quite likely that Cat. used *lectulus* not as differing in the least from *lectus* in meaning, but to give a sort of diminutive cast to the whole sentence. In the other case the dim. may perhaps allude to the youth or beauty or virginity of Ariadne, though that seems sufficiently far-fetched.

19) *libellum*. ^{1. 1, 4} ~~11. 8, 14. 12, 55. 4.~~ Too common to need any note.

20) *lucellum*.

28. 6-8 Ecquidnam in tabulis patet lucelli
Expensum, ut mihi, qui meum secutus
Praetorem refero datum lucello
"O Memmi . . ."

Cat. does not use *lucrum*. *Lucellum* is found in Cicero, Horace and Seneca, sometimes with an unmistakable dim. meaning, but in one or two cases without it. Cat. here twists Verannius and Fabulla on the stinginess of Piso, and the contrast between the considerable profit they expected to make and their actual loss. Hence the most general idea of 'gain' or 'profit' seems to be required, and the dim. idea is lacking.

21) *munuscum*.

64. 103 Non ingrata tamen frustra munuscula divis
Promittens . . .
68. 145 Sed furtiva dedit muta munuscula nocte
Ipsius ex ipso dempta viri gremio.

Cat. uses *munus* fifteen times. The dim. occurs twice in Cicero, in Vergil, Juvenal and Horace. Cat. does not use *munus* of gifts

sent by a woman, and it is a probable inference that the dim. is used for such gifts. Otherwise no difference in meaning would be easily discernible.

22) *ocellus*. 3. 18, 31. 2, 43. 2, 45. 11, 50. 10, 19, 64. 60.

Oculus Cat. uses fourteen times. In 3. 18, 43. 2, 45. 11, 50. 12, 64. 60 *ocellus* means the eye literally.

In 3. 18 Tua nunc opera meae puellae

Flendo turgiduli rubent ocelli.

43. 2 Salve, nec minimo puella naso

Nec bello pede, nec nigris ocellis

45. 11 At Acme leviter caput reflectens

Et dulcis pueri ebrios ocellos

it is applied to the eyes of a lover, and the dim. is expressive of affection undoubtedly.

In 50. 10 Nec somnus tergeret quiete ocellos

Catullus is speaking of his own anguish, inability to sleep and desire to see Calvus. The dim. is equivalent to 'my poor eyes.'

In 64. 60 Quem procul ex alga maestis Minois ocellis
Saxeа ut effigies bacchantis, prospicit, eheu.

it is applied to Ariadne's eyes, and probably denotes very much the same thing as in 50. 10.

In 31. 2 Paeninsularum, Sirmio, insularumque
Ocelle

it is applied to the promontory of Sirmio, in the sense of jewel, and in

50. 19 Oramus, cave despudas, ocelle,

it is addressed to Calvus, in the sense of 'dear heart.'

Plainly, then, in all but two cases it has a distinct dim. idea, and hence it is best to assign a similar meaning to it in these two.

23) *palmula*.

4. 4 sive palmulis Opus foret volare

4. 17 Tuo imbuisse palmulas in aequore

Palmula meant first the oar-blade, but Vergil seems to have used it for *remus*. Cat. has *remus* also twice, but here it is altogether likely that any original dim. notion has vanished from *palmula*.

24) *papilla*. 55. 12, 61. 101, 64. 65, 66. 81.

Used frequently of a woman's breasts. *Mamma* is not found in Cat. at all, and probably *papilla* was the regular term in poetry of this sort. A dim. would be quite in place, although it is, on the whole, probable that most of the dim. signification of this form had been lost.

25) *ponticulus*.

17. 3 O Colonia, quae cupis ponte ludere longo,
Et salire paratum habes, sed vereris inepta
Crura ponticuli assulis stantis in redivivis.

This dim. occurs once in Cicero, Columella and Suetonius. *Pons* is frequent in Cat., and here the dim. has its idea of worthlessness.

26) *puellula*. 57. 9, 61. 57. 178. 184.

This occurs once elsewhere in Latin literature proper: Ter. Phor. 81. Cat. uses *puella* continually, and this noteworthy double dim. probably expresses an additional idea of fondness and endearment.

27) *pupula*. 63. 56 Cupit ipsa pupula ad te dirigere aciem.28) *pupulus*.

56. 5 Deprendi modo pupulum puellae Trusantem . . .

Both of these diminutives occur a few times elsewhere, *pupula* more frequently than *pupulus*. *Pupus* and *pupa* are not found in Cat. To the diminutives there seems to be attached a real dim. signification in these two passages.

29) *ramulus*.

61. 22 Floridis velut enitens
Myrtus Asia ramulis.

This dim. occurs in Cato, Cicero, Pliny. In Cat. we find *ramus* once. There seems to be no reason for not assigning to the dim. form a true dim. meaning—twigs.

30) *sacculus*.

13. 8 nam tui Catulli
Plenus sacculus est araneorum.

This dim. is not uncommon, and other writers seem to use *soccus*, *sacculus* and *sacellus* oftentimes as synonymous. It would

purse to match
money carried - not
purse to match his not. money

seem here—at least from one point of view—that there should be no dim. idea, for the larger the purse, the greater its load of emptiness, and the more forcible the figure. Probably therefore *sacculus* = *saccus*.

31) *salillum*. 23. 19 Quod culus tibi purior salillost.

This dim. was formerly read in Plaut. Trin. 2. 4. 91, but later editors read *vatillum* or *scintillula*. If it is removed from Plautus, it remains $\pi\pi. \lambda\epsilon\gamma$. Cat. does not use *salinum*, and there does not seem to be anything in the passage to show the slightest variation in meaning between that and this dim. form.

32) *sarcinula*.

28. 2 Pisonis comites, cohors inanis
Aptis sarcinulis et expeditis.

This dim. occurs several times. Cat. does not use *sarcina*. It appears to be quite impossible to tell here whether there is any dim. signification or not.

33) *solaciolum*. 2. 7 Ut solaciolum sui doloris.

The only other case of occurrence of this word is in CIL. 8. 7427 *solaciolum vitae*. Here there is doubtless a real diminutive meaning intended.

34) *suaviolum*.

99. 2 Suaviolum dulci dulcius ambrosia
99. 14 Suaviolum tristi tristius helleboro.

This is found twice in Apuleius. *Suavium* is found twice in Cat., and here he intends to convey the dim. notion of added sweetness in the first line, and kept the same form in the antithesis.

35) *tabella*. 32. 5 Nequis liminis obseret tabellam.

An exceedingly common word in various meanings. Just what it means here is not certain, and hence any inference about its dim. force must be vague. The probability is that there is no particular dim. notion, even if Bährens' explanation be accepted.

36) *tantillum*. 99. 6 Tantillum vostrae demere saevitiae.

Rather rare as a subst., but its dim. sense is always apparent.

37) *tigillum*.

67. 39 (ianua) sed hic suffixa tigillo
Tantum operire soles aut operire domum.

A common word, used quite regularly of such a piece of wood, for instance, as that from which a door-jamb is made. Originally a true dim., though in Catullus' time men were hardly conscious of that idea, in using the word.

38) *versiculus*.

16. 3 Qui me ex versiculis meis putastis
16. 6 Ipsum, versiculos nihil necesset
50. 4 Scribens versiculos uterque nostrum

Very common, and used with dim. signification of disparagement. Cat. uses *versus* twice only.

39) *villula*.

26. 1 Furi, villula nostra non ad Austri
Flatus oppositast.

Occurs in Cicero, Horace and Apuleius; and has a regular dim. meaning. *Villa* is found once in Cat.

40) *zonula*.

61. 53 tibi virgines
Zonula solvunt sinus.

Found in Serenus ap. Non. 539. Cat. uses *zona* twice, and as a small waist was not regarded as an object of beauty by the Romans, *zonula* can hardly be explained as meaning a short girdle. If there is any distinctive idea in this form here, it must lie in the general affectionate turn of the whole thought.

II (b). ἄπαξ λεγόμενα.

1) *femella*.

55. 7 In Magni simul ambulatione
Femellas omnes, amici, prendi,
Quas vultu vidi tamen serenas.

Cat. uses *femina* four times. It is quite probable, as Ellis suggests, that *femellae* here means 'light women.' That suits the context and there is no other good way of making any difference in meaning between *femella* and *femina*.

2) *medullula*.

25. 2 Cinaede Thalle, mollior cuniculi capillo
Vel anseris medullula vel imula oricilla.

There is a dispute about the meaning of this word. Voss suggests the inner feathers, which are the softest; Bährens, the fat or liver; others, the pith inside the feather. There is, however, no doubt that the force of the dim. ending is to intensify the idea of softness, as *medulla* is found in each of the senses given above.

3) *oricilla*. 25. 2 (just quoted). For *auricilla*, corresponding to *auricula* 67. 44. The explanation of this dim. is the same as that of *medullula*, although in it the idea is not so readily suggested. Cat. probably intended to produce the desired effect by the combination of words rather than by assigning a definite dim. meaning to the individual words.

4) *scortillum*.

10. 3 Varus me meus ad suos amores
Visum duxerat e foro otiosum,
Scortillum, ut mihi tum repente visumst,
Non sane inlepidum neque invenustum.

Cat. uses *scortum* once. Here one may suppose that there is a primary dim. signification, or one of contempt, or one of endearment. It is impossible to say with any certainty. It is not by any means evident that it has any of these ideas, nor that it differs in the least from *scortum*.

5) *sicula*.

67. 21 Languidior tenera cui pendens sicula beta
Numquam se medianam sustulit ad tunicam.

Cat. does not use *sica*, and the dim. sense of *sicula* is obvious.

In looking over these nouns it appears that there are some, perhaps seven or eight, like *articulus*, *codicilli*, *flagellum*, etc., whose original dim. meaning had probably been lost sight of. Taking these out of the whole number, the ratio between those nouns in which we can see a plain dim. signification of some kind, and those in which there appears to be no such significance, is about three to one. Of course, exactness is impossible, for the

purpose of the reader enters into the question very largely. It is difficult to keep one's mind absolutely or even reasonably free from preconceptions about the matter. From going through these words I have come to these conclusions: (1) In many cases the lexicons fail entirely of giving the real meaning of the dim.; cf. *tenellulus*. (2) In the adjectives in the majority of instances there is no apparent difference in meaning between the dim. and regular form. (3) In nouns the case is exactly reversed, and for most of these the dim. sense is plain. (4) Catullus was unusually fond of the dim. form as well as meaning, and though in most cases of nouns and some adjectives the meaning is prominent, in the other nouns and most adjectives he uses the dim. form for itself, through analogy, or for reasons of rhythm and metre.

It is indisputable that in a true poet like Catullus form and meaning go together, and can hardly be separated, but it is nevertheless true that oftentimes the student can see which has been most powerful in its action on the poet's mind.

It is quite likely that in some of these words the true sense has been missed, but on the whole the conclusions seem justified.

SAMUEL BALL PLATNER.

III.—ON A LEGEND OF THE ALBAN LAKE TOLD BY DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS.

The methods used by the ancient writers in dealing with the early history of the Roman Commonwealth are now too well understood to require any comment in detail. The final result of their labors as seen on the pages of Livy and Dionysius, however interesting it may be to the student of folklore, national character or literature, brings small comfort to the admirer of history as a truthful record of events. The early Roman annalist found himself in a position peculiarly difficult. His own lack of training in the investigation of materials for history was only equalled by the poverty in such materials. Furthermore, while the legends of Rome distinctly connected her with the old mother-city of Alba Longa, while the story of Romulus and Remus was a national inheritance, it was perfectly evident that the tale of Aeneas was a stranger. But the tale of Aeneas could not be set aside by the patriotic historian, for at the close of the second Punic war it assumed, as Nissen has observed,¹ a distinctly political importance. Hence the early annalists were confronted with the problem of so adapting it as to agree with and form a part of the native legends, which were too well known to be ignored. The task was difficult and constantly grew more so as the years went on and investigation developed in scope and accuracy. One of the most vexatious arose when chronology began to assert its claims. It was then discovered that between the fall of Troy and the foundation of Rome was a gap of over three hundred years. To bridge the chasm was devised the list of Alban kings from Ascanius to Amilius, in its finally accepted form the latest and most evident forgery in the whole story. The investigators who first discovered this formidable hiatus perhaps contented themselves with the statement that there had been a royal house at Alba through which the blood of Aeneas was transmitted to the founders of

¹ Jahn's Jahrb. 91, p. 384; Schwegler, Röm. Gesch. I, p. 305 ff.

Rome. It is a significant fact that the list of Alban kings, fully equipped with names and dates—and not much else—does not emerge until the fortunes of the Roman State were bound up with the personal interests of a family which claimed descent from Anchises and Venus. Mommsen¹ is undoubtedly correct in his conjecture that the person most responsible was Alexander Polyhistor; his literary habits are plainly reflected in the list of Alban kings as we now find it in the surviving writers.

The general consensus of critics that this list is a pure invention and probably originated in Greek literature rests on a number of proofs of which the integrity can scarcely be questioned. The names themselves are, most of them, palpably strangers to their surroundings, and "sehr wohlfeil zusammengebettelt," as Schwegler says (*Röm. Gesch.* I, p. 343, n. 2). A great deal of variation in the different lists is to be observed, the number 330 has a suspiciously ritualistic appearance, the unusual exactness in dates is coupled with a noticeable reticence of historical details. Historical details are, in fact, limited to brief notices attached to the names of three kings. Tiberinus was drowned in the river Albula, after which it was called the Tiber. Aventinus was buried on the Mons Aventinus: hence its name. Both of these stories are, of course, aetiological and may be summarily dismissed. The third king, variously named, was an impious tyrant. He imitated thunder and lightning; therefore the god slew him with a real thunderbolt. It is this story which I wish to examine in detail, taking as a basis the narrative of Dionysius, who in prose is the chief exponent of the Aeneas legend. His account (*Antiq. Rom.* I 71, 3 ff.) is as follows: "And after Agrippa came Allodius, who reigned nineteen years, a monster of tyranny whom the gods hated: for, scorning the divine powers, he fashioned imitations of lightning and loud noises resembling claps of thunder, with which he thought to terrify men, as if he were a god. But tempests and thunderbolts rushed down upon his dwelling and, the lake having risen to an unwonted height, he and all his house were overwhelmed and destroyed. And to this day, if the lake is clear in a certain quarter, whenever the flow of

¹ *Röm. Chron.*, p. 156. Polyhistor was afterwards abetted by Castor. There was also a considerable mass of tradition in the time of the Caesars originating in certain private families, not to mention other matters suggested by grammatical and antiquarian research. Fragments are still visible in the Servian Commentary to Vergil. See Cauer, *Röm. Aeneassage*, p. 144 ff.

water from the source subsides and the depths are undisturbed,¹ the ruins of porticoes and other traces of a dwelling are still visible."

The fragment of Diodorus Siculus (Book 7, Frag. 5) which relates this story was preserved in the Armenian version of the Chronicle of Eusebius. The narrative is the same, except that the king is named *Arramulius* Silvius and that his method of imitating thunder is described: "Sometimes, when at harvest time the rolling of thunder was loud and continuous, he would order his troops, at the word of command, to beat their weapons in unison upon their shields, thinking that the sound so produced could surpass the very thunder itself." It is interesting to compare this version with the abbreviated form of the same passage found in the *Excerpta de Virtutibus et Vitiis*.² The excerptor calls the king *Romulus* Silvius, but tells briefly the same story until the king imitates thunder. He then closes with a curt διὸς κεραυνωθῆναι. The omission of all which follows in his original is characteristic of the moralizer as opposed to the story-teller, and illustrates the readiness with which a legend is altered or modified to suit the purposes of the narrator.

Zonaras (7, 1, D.) calls the king *Amulius*, the son of Tiberinus. "He dared to assume the attributes of a god and was so vain-glorious as to artificially rival thunder with thunder, to rival lightning with lightning and to hurl thunderbolts. Wherefore he perished utterly, for the lake by which he dwelt rose suddenly and destroyed both him and his palace."

The *Origo Gentis Romanae* (18, 2) calls the king *Aremulus* Silvius, follows the account of Diodorus in the description of his sin, and then says that "he was struck by lightning, swept away by a whirlwind and cast into the Alban lake, as we are told in book VI of the Annals and the Epitome of Piso, II. Aufidius, however, in his Epitomae, and Domitius, book I, say that he was not struck by lightning, but that it was an earthquake which cast

¹ ὅταν ὑπονοστήσῃ τὸ νῦμα καὶ σταθερὸς ὁ βυθὸς γένηται. Usually translated "when the lake is low, recedes from its usual height," etc., as though νῦμα here were used simply as a variant of the more usual λίμνη, which occurs in the same sentence. But the Alban lake is entirely fed from the bottom by gushing springs. From this point of view νῦμα in its usual sense becomes perfectly intelligible and the term σταθερὸς is eminently proper, as every hill-dweller who is familiar with such pools would be aware. Hence Cobet's emendation (Obs., p. 134) to φανερός is quite unnecessary.

² See Diodorus, Book 7, Frag. 7.

him and his palace together into the Alban lake." Jordan (*Hermes*, 3, 421 ff.) shows that this work is a forgery of the fifth or sixth century and that the author got most of his materials from the Vergilian commentators. The alternative here proposed of an earthquake is perhaps too summarily dismissed by Jordan, but, of course, the parade of references is not to be taken seriously. This is merely Ancient Learning in her second childhood.

Livy, with more than usual caution, has reduced the story to the lowest terms compatible with existence, contenting himself with the bare statement "fulmine ictus." His name for the king is *Romulus* Silvius.

Ovid tells the story twice, each time with a different authority before him. In the *Metamorphoses* (14, 616 ff.) he says that Tiberinus had two sons, *Remulus* and Acrota. "Remulus the elder perished by the lightning—he had imitated it. Acrota, who was more temperate than his brother, left the sceptre to Aventinus." In the *Fasti* (4, 49) he tells of Tiberinus, of his son Agrippa, and of *Remulus*, his grandson. "They say," he adds, "that thunderbolts were cast at Remulus. After these came Aventinus," etc. These passages are one of the many proofs which show how uncertain and conflicting were the various lists of Alban kings. To be sure, Ovid wrote poetry, not dissertations, but it would be dangerous to adopt Cauer's suggestion (*Röm. Aeneassage*, p. 149) that metre in this case had anything to do with even a change of names. Metre never prevented Ovid from telling a story as he desired. Taking into consideration Ovid's surpassing ability as a story-teller, the omission of any reference to the rising of the lake, etc.—from the poet's point of view certainly the most telling portion of the story—would lead us to believe that there was no mention of it in either of the authorities which he consulted.

All we learn from the version of Dion Cassius is the name *Amulius*, registered by Tzetzes (*Scholia ad Lycoph.* 1250). Appian is only quoted by Photius, and is represented by the statement that *Romulus* was struck by lightning.

The Chronicle of Hieronymus and the probably mutilated account of Syncellus (p. 148) agree in calling the king *Aremulus* Silvius, and in saying that he reigned 19 years and was blasted for impiety. Cassiodorus calls him *Aremulus* and the "Χρονογράφειον Σύντομον," Ἐρεμούλιος. The *Excerpta Latini Barbari* says: "Ταρ-
cyinius Silvius regnavit annos XVIII," a statement chiefly valuable

as showing how readily these people identify one tyrant with another better known.¹

How much and in what way the narrators of these different versions depend upon each other or their predecessors is a matter not pertinent to the present enquiry. For this, reference is made to Mommsen, Röm. Chron., p. 150 ff., and especially to Fr. Cauer, 'Die röm. Aeneassage von Naevius bis Vergilius,' 15. Supplement-band der Jahrb. f. class. Philologie.

When we compare the different statements of the legend, we notice, among other things, the variation in the name of the king. There is really less variation, however, than would appear at first sight. *Romulus*, *Remulus* and *Aremulus* are practically identical.² *Amulius* (like *Tarcynius* of the *Excerpt. Lat. Bar.*) was doubtless suggested by another tyrant better known. *Arramulius* (Euseb., Armen. Vers.) and 'Ἐρεμούλιος (Χρον. Συγγ.) are probably the result either of bad text or a combination of the names Amulius and Remulus. The identity of *Allodius* (occurring only in Dionysius) and *Amulius* has lately been pointed out by Trieber, 'Die Königstafel von Alba Longa,' Hermes, 29, 130. It would be time lost to seek for any name in these variants better than the rest, since none of them appear to have had any historical foundation.

Comparison of versions also shows that the different narrators felt that the important point in this story was the fact that the king, whatever his name was, was struck by lightning. It is the one thing which they have in common.³ Livy, indeed, has nothing else. Others, again, add the reason why he was blasted. He was impious. He defied the gods. One need not confine himself to the classics for parallels to this part of the story. In all countries and times the signal retribution of blasphemy or impiety has always been thought to be the thunderbolt. The writer recollects two or three such anecdotes which were told him in boyhood, while within a few months the idea has again come to the surface in an article entitled 'The Strange Fate of Major Rogers, a Buddhistic Mystery,' Arena, Dec. 1894, p. 71 ff. Still a third class specify the sort of blasphemy of which the Alban

¹ On the Chron. of 354 and the willful alterations there, see Mommsen, p. 649.

² See Preller-Jordan, Röm. Mythol. 2, 336, n. 2, and 283, n. 4.

³ Except Zonaras, with whom, as he is an epitomizer, the omission scarcely counts.

king was guilty. He imitated thunder and lightning. Here the likeness to the legend of Salmoneus (*Apoll.* 1, 7) is, of course, plainly visible.¹

But Dionysius and Diodorus relate the most interesting part of the story in telling us how the lake rose and overwhelmed Allodius and all his house, and how, to this day, ruins of that house are sometimes to be seen at the bottom. Every one will at once be reminded of those legends of submerged cities and palaces told of in all parts of the world, some of them, like the famous *Vineta*, so well known as to have become the commonplace of folklore. *Sipylus*, *Helice* and *Bura*² are examples from classical antiquity. Thirlwall³ many years ago drew attention to the kinship of the Allodius story with this group of legends, but, so far as I have been able to discover, no one since then has either mentioned his name in this connection or, indeed, made the slightest reference to the same point in this version.

Did Polyhistor or Castor or their like invent this portion of the Allodius story on the analogy of something similar in Greek, for it should be observed that Tantalus, also punished for impiety, was closely connected with Sipylus, a city which was overtaken by a similar fate? If the Allodius story had such an origin it would be current only among those who had read or copied the author. Or, on the other hand, is it an ancient folk-legend of the Alban lake fitted into this portion of so-called Roman history? If we really needed to be convinced that the truth lay in the second alternative, we might appeal to the legend, which is still current in the neighborhood of the Lago Albano. Thirlwall had it from his young guide, who told it as follows: "Where the lake now lies there once stood a great city. Here, when Jesus Christ came into Italy, he begged alms. None took compassion on him but one old woman, who gave him two handfuls of meal. He bade her leave the city; she obeyed: the city instantly sank and the lake rose in its place."

¹ Although C. Robert seems to have been the first to mention it. See Preller-Jordan, *Röm. Mythol.* 2, 338, note.

² Ovid alone (*Met.* 15, 293) has the form *Burin*, probably from the analogy of the Latin word *buris*. See Burmann ad loc. Legends of this sort might be cited indefinitely. Reference may be had, among many others, to Grimm, D. M. 981 ff.; D. S., Nos. 22 and 131; Gerstäcker's *Germelshausen*; Bassett, *Legends of the Sea*, with references, etc.

³ *Literary Remains*, vol. III, pp. 189-210.

No one, I am sure, will claim a literary origin for this story, however remote. It has lost much of the pomp and circumstance which it probably once had, it has been outwardly affected by the habits of mediaeval Italy, but investigation will show it to be nearer the original than Dionysius is. The Lago Albano lies in the crater of an extinct volcano and has no visible natural outlet. It is surrounded by an unbroken ring of rock, the lowest point of which is 240 feet above the present surface of the lake, itself nearly 2000 feet above the level of the sea. It is six miles long and nearly 500 feet deep. How did such a large hole get here, and how did there come to be a lake in it? The primitive philosopher usually answers such questions as these with a story. And judging from similar stories, we may be sure that in this case it was not, as Diodorus and Dionysius tell it, an incident connected with the lake, but that, like the modern legend, it accounted for the very existence of the lake itself and the peculiar configuration of the surrounding country.

"Here was once a table-land," said the old story, "and upon it a city. This city or some king of it was impious: the land sank with it, making a great hole: a lake rose and covered it up. The ruins of that city or palace may still be seen at the bottom when the water is clear." These would appear to have been the main outlines of the legend before it entered the domain of literature, but long after the age of savagery, if indeed this particular story connected with the Alban lake originated in a period of such low culture. The idea of sinking land might easily be suggested by the observed effects of volcanic action. The legend of M. Curtius (Livy 7, 6), the *Campus Ignifer*, the *Ludi Tarentini*, certain details of ritual to the infernal gods, etc., show how late was the cessation of such activity in the old Roman territory.

That the lake was in the habit of rising from time to time is abundantly shown by traces of its action upon the surrounding banks, and that it sometimes overflowed and did much injury to the adjacent slopes and lowlands is proved by the famous *Emissarium*, by which, to this day, the lake is prevented from rising above its present level. The work is doubtless prehistoric, for the story of its origin, the soothsayer, the fall of Veii, etc., told by Livy (5, 19) as occurring A. U. C. 358, B. C. 396, is probably merely a folk-tale to account for the origin of a work about which the Romans really knew nothing. Every one knows the inveterate habit the Roman annalists had of rationalizing the legends

with which they had to deal. It seems to me that the observed fact of an ancient rise and fall of the Alban lake has determined the direction in which this story of Allodius was rationalized by the authorities of Diodorus and Dionysius. They set the palace of the impious king on the *banks* of the lake, which was reasonable enough; they made the water rise and engulf him and his palace, which experience had shown was quite possible: but in saying that the porticoes, etc., of that palace may still be seen in the *bottom* of the lake, they were inconsistent with the story they had started to tell. In this oversight a hint of the original version is perhaps preserved.

In most of these legends of submerged cities it is to be observed that the immediate cause of submersion, if any is alleged, is divine retribution for blasphemy or impiety. The same has already been pointed out with reference to the thunderbolt. This leads us directly to one of the most common phenomena in popular legends, but one which is often overlooked by students of folklore: I mean the justifiable inference that the narrative of Diodorus and Dionysius is a *contaminatio* of two stories originally distinct, but both of them consecrated as recounting the signal vengeance of heaven for impiety, and hence their juxtaposition here. The portion still current in the modern version is a local folk-legend of the Alban lake, going back to an immemorial antiquity, and imperfectly rationalized in the version of Dionysius. The story of the lightning, especially when we recollect that the activity of Polyhistor lies largely in the period when it first appears, has a very suspicious resemblance to the legend of Salmoneus. But while both of these stories are alike conventional instances of divine retribution, the one is never more than local, the other is known the world over, among all men and at all times. This is perhaps the principal reason, besides characteristic perversity, why the Roman writers selected the cheap invention of a third-rate annalist and rejected the not less improbable and perhaps the only fragment of genuine Italic tradition, relieving the deadly barrenness of the list of Alban kings so religiously repeated by all loyal supporters of the imperial house of Caesar.¹

KIRBY F. SMITH.

¹ The legend told by Dionysius has been utilized by Baffico in a short story: 'Fascino Arcano,' Nuova Antologia, 47, p. 244. I have not yet discovered it anywhere else in literature.

IV.—LYSIDEM POST A. 394 A. CHR. N. COMPOSITUM ESSE.

Platonicorum series dialogorum magnae semper fuit res controversiae neque, quando quemque auctor dialogum composuerit, satis constat, si parvum modo numerum exceperis. Huic plerumque numero Socraticos quos dicunt aut minores dialogos docti ascripserunt minimaque de his quidem exarsit contentio. Verum enimvero, etsi ingratum atque importunum videtur, bello iam satis superque acerbo novam subcere materiem, tamen, variis atque ut opinor validis rationibus compulsus, ne in Socratis quidem dialogis comprobandam esse consensionem quasi universam censeo ac Lysidem certe ei numero eximere conabor. Omnes prope adhuc scriptores ducibus Schleiermachero atque Zellero, sequentibus recenti tempore Windelbandio¹ atque Hammondio,² Lysidem circa a. 404 a. Chr. n. compositum esse contenterunt, solus Weiszäcker, bellicosus ille Tubingensis professor, a. 387 eundem attribuit dialogum, ut qui proxime ad Symposium a. 387 editum accedat. Ego igitur Tubingensem non multum a vero aberrasse iudicaverim, sed cum ille levibus tantum atque infirmis argumentis usus sit, denuo et acrioribus armis rem esse gerendam existimo.

Minoribus dialogis singulas Plato virtutes tractat, sapientiam fortitudinem moderationem iustitiam pietatem, plano utique stilo negotium aggreditur, nullam idearum facit mentionem, philosophos qui in eadem via antecesserunt non consultit. At longe alium disserendi modum idem auctor in Lyside usurpat. Non singulas excerpit virtutes, sed unam statuit bonum consectandi esse virtutem, summi illius boni ita definit qualitatem, ut ideae locum occupare videatur,³ philosophos denique sui aut vetustioris temporis non ille quidem nominatim appellat, at certe quos in quaestionem advocet, dilucide indicat. Cuius rei nonnulla iuvat exempla afferre. Multus est Plato de similium cum similibus aut familiaritate aut contentione (Lys. 214 c); notum illud *αἰεὶ τοι τὸν*

¹ Editio sec. 1894.

² Hammond, 137.

³ Harvard Studies, III (1892) 135 and 137.

ὅμοιον ἄγει θεὸς ὡς τὸν ὅμοιον cum argumenti loco usurpasset, ut similiū inter se amicitiam comprobaret, rursus dubitat num similes quicquam similibus auxilii afferre possint. Nam cum mali nullo modo familiares possint fieri, similitudinem nonnisi in bonis ad formandam valere amicitiam, atqui bonis et strenuis, cum sibi ipsi sufficient ad vitam bene beateque instituendam, nullam ex amicis crescere utilitatem, neminem igitur esse, quem desiderent, quem amare opus habeant: quare effici, ut nulla inter similes familiaritas aut amor existere videatur. Subtilis admodum Platonis est parumque comprobata dissertatio, utpote quae similitudinis nimis premat notionem, sed quare in minutias eas descenderit, facile explicabimus, si vetustius quoddam dictum hic ab eo explosum crediderimus. Adest Democritus, vir sane non contemnendus, qui circa a. 400 a. Chr. n. scripta condidit philosophica¹; is duodecimo quod superest operum fragmento de similitudine ita agit, ut difficillimae quaestioni minime par fuisse perspiciatur. Hoc quo manifestius sit, locum Democriti, quem interpres Mullachius parum, credo, intellexit, infra adiciam. Dicit igitur Theophrastus in libro quem de sensibus edidit hunc fere in modum²: "Democritus, utrum contrariis sensus fiat an similibus, non definit; quatenus enim mutatione sensum existere iudicat, diversis hunc fieri existimaverit, neque enim (ait Theophrastus) similia mutantur similibus. Rursus autem sensum atque omnino mutationem patiendo fieri censem (Democritus); atqui fieri posse negat, ut dissimilia patientur, et ut ea quae dissimilia sint, dissimilia illa quidem faciant, eadem vero quae similia patientur." Ergo, adiciat quispiam, Democrito similiū potius inter se actionem placuisse appareat, quod secundo eiusdem fragmento confirmatur.³ Sextus enim Empiricus: "Vetus quaedam, ait, et iam pridem recepta inter physicos versatur opinio, similia similibus cognosci, eiusque opinionis etiam Democritus rationes videlicet attulit probabiles tetigitque eam etiam Plato, ut visum est, in Timaeo. Sed Democritus de animatis et inanimis quaestionem instituit. Animantia enim, inquit, simul congregantur cum eiusdem generis animantibus, ut columbae cum columbis . . . utpote rerum in his similitudine habente vim quandam congregandi." Talem aut similem locum Plato respexerit, cum quidem sapientissimorum commemorat scripta virorum (vid. Lys. 214 a), in quibus hoc invenerit, simile simili necessario semper esse amicum. "Haec est, ait,

¹ Mullach, Fr. philos. graec. I 331.

² Ib. 359.

³ Ib. 357.

eorum sententia, qui de natura deque universo colloquuntur et scribunt." Ac paulo post, reiecta similiū inter se amicitia, ubi dissimiliū temptavit familiaritatem, ad eosdem rursus philosophos, Ionicos dicos, se refugere fingit meminisseque aliquem disserere ait de eadem re, qui simili simile quam possit maxime esse inimicum contenderet. Quae inter se sint simillima, ea invidia aemulatione contentionē abundare, quae vero dissimillima, ea amicitia repleri. Eundem addidisse auctorem oratione usum magnificentiore: Unum quodque non simile sed contrarium appetere, aridum humida, calida frigidum, dulcia amarum, contrarium enim contrario alimentum praebere. Haec nimirum collaudans Plato eloquentiam scriptoris, quem excerptserat hoc loco, admodum extollit, ut videlicet facundae inanitas dictionis refutatione quae sequitur sententiae magis ridicula videatur. Nam dissimiliū quoque inter se amorem Plato repellit. Facile autem est conicere, de quo potissimum scriptore Plato cogitaverit, nam quasi sua sponte se praebet Heraclitus, cuius doctrinae multa in Platonis cogitationes redundasse constat. Heracliti enim per orbem terrarum notum est illud bellum omnium rerum patrem esse, quae sane sententia cum loco quem apposuimus Lysideo mirum quantum consentit; idem sublatis gravibus et acerbis, sublatae feminae et maris differentia, pulcritudinem ex natura rerum tolli ex diversis vero concordiam formosissimam oriri affirmavit.¹ Secutus est Heraclitum Empedocles Siculus; amore et odio cuncta explanare conatus, qui cum mutationis et generationis arcana solvere temptaret, separationem atque divisionem in natura rerum fieri statuit, mutationem negavit veteremque illam de similibus dissimilibusve quaestionem ita composuit, ut utrumque usu venire contenderet; modo enim amore coniuncta, inimicitia modo disiuncta tamen eadem semper naturae elementa manere sibique constantia docuit.² Via non multum ab Empedocle discrepante Diogenes ingressus est Apolloniates, Democriti fere aequalis et Empedoclis; is enim³: "Mihi videntur, ait, res cunctae ab eodem elemento variatione oriri atque idem esse. Nam si mundi huius alia ab aliis suapte natura different, neque multisfariis etsi modis mutata et variata, eadem tamen esse manerent, neque misceri inter se neque aut commoda aut incommoda invicem sibi inferre possent. Nec vel planta e terra nasci vel

¹ Zeller, A Hist. of Greek Philos. II 32.

² Ib. II 123.

³ Mullach, I 254, 2.

animal aliudve quicquam procreari posset, nisi eadem cum isdem consisterent; quin haec omnia ab eadem origine ab alienata alia aliam speciem induunt rursusque in idem recedunt.

Talia igitur reiecturus Plato tertium quoddam statuit, quod neque simile neque dissimile esset, notionem videlicet superterrestrem, cuius res terrestres etiamsi toto genere distantes partem tamen arriperent. Prius autem quam ad novam illam doctrinam accederet, levibus argumentis Ionum placita philosophorum disseruit, quae quidem argumenta "dialecticis sapientissimis" (216 a) attribuit. Dubium esse non potest, quin Antisthenem atque Megaricos his verbis notaverit Plato, qui acerrimam in illos inimicitiam exercebat. Atque etiam verbum *oiketos* (221 e), quod frequenter Socrates in Lyside usurpavit, valde primum, ut videtur, isto vocabulo gavitus, vel maximi apud Megaricos momenti erat. Quod cum Antisthenis prima opera ad annum fere 395 a. Chr. n. referenda sint, Lysidem quoque post Socratis mortem compositum accipiemus, eo magis quod in dialogis ante dictam mortem editis Ionum quae in Lyside deteximus vestigia nusquam apparent.

Ludicum sit, ex stili perfectione aut idearum, quarum sane animadvertisimus in Lyside initia, certi quicquam asserere; quod ad tempus dialogi accuratius constituendum valeat; alia enim aliis tali in quaestione videri satis superque constat. Illud tamen liceat afferre, miram inter Lysidem et Symposium et propositi et idearum exsistere similitudinem. Uterque dialogus in amore definiundo versatur, utroque bonum idem atque *oiketos* declaratur summique boni amore stare amicitiam efficitur, denique *ἔρως τοῦ μὴ παρόντος* atque *ἐνθυμεῖν οὐ ἐνδέεις ἔστι* et similia utroque opusculo pariter occurunt.¹ Huc accedunt etiam aliae observationes. Nam cum minorum dialogorum exordia idem fere loci occupent, quod argumenti ipsius tractatio cumque posteriorum exordia nullum paene spatium impleant, rerum in Lyside enarratio duabus fere totius dialogi septimis constat, et quinque colloquium de amicitia institutum eademque rerum gestarum ac propriae dissertationis in Symposium ratio invenitur. Docti autem quidam cum particulae *ār* frequentia quo quisque tempore dialogus scriptus sit, indagare inceperint, ne hoc quidem contemnendum argumentum ipsum quoque Lysidem quam potest proxime cum Symposium coniungit, eadem particulae istius demonstrata frequentia. Sed haec, quamquam infiniti fuit opus laboris, leviter strinxisse sufficiat.² Neque

¹Cf. Lysid. 218, 221; Sympos. 200 sq., 206.

²Vide etiam Lysidis cum Gorgia relationem apud Schleiermacherum, II 1, 17.

enim his solis quamvis copulatione valentibus argumentis uspiam satis effici arbitratus, tamen ad viam muniendam haec aptissima fuisse iudico.

Omnis fere consentiunt, exstisset inter Platonem et Xenophonem inimicitiam locoque praeclarorum Protagorae convivium Xenophontem vituperari. Mihi ergo etiam in Lyside locus esse videtur, qui manifesto ad Xenophontis sententiam deridendam valeat. Quaerit enim in Memorabilium libro secundo (VI 17) Critobulus, quemadmodum amicum caperet, "Οπως θηρατέος; eique respondeatur: Μὰ Δι" οὐ κατὰ πόδας ὥσπερ ὁ λαγῶς οὐδὲ ἀπάτη ὥσπερ αἱ ὄρνιθες οὐδὲ βίᾳ ὥσπερ οἱ κάπροι. ἀκούτα γὰρ φίλον ἐλεῖν ἐργάδες . . . εἴναι μέν τινάς φασιν ἐπωδάς, ἂν οἱ ἐπιστάμενοι ἐπάδοντες οἵς ἀν βούλωνται φίλους αὐτοὺς ποιοῦνται" εἴναι δὲ καὶ φίλτρα, οἵς οἱ ἐπιστάμενοι πρὸς οὓς ἀν βούλωνται χρώμενοι φίλοῦνται ὑπ' αὐτῶν. . . . "Α μὲν αἱ Σειρῆνες ἐπῆδον τῷ Ὁδυσσεῖ . . . τοῖς ἐπ' ἀρετῇ φιλοτιμούμενοι οὐτως ἐπῆδον. Si non adulaciones, at certe dulcia verba eis offerre, quorum quis amicus fieri vellet, hoc Xenophon optimum ad venationem faustam esse auxilium significat, cantibusque ut praedam demulceant venatores manifesto suadet. Quid Plato ad hoc? Ποίος τίς σοι, ait, δοκεῖ θηρευτής εἴναι, εἰ ἀναστοβοΐη θηρεύων καὶ δυσαλωτοτέραν τὴν ἄγραν ποιοῖ; Δῆλον ὅτι φαῦλος. Καὶ μὲν δὴ λόγοις τε καὶ φέδαις μὴ κηλεῖν, ἀλλὰ ἔξαγριαν πολλὴ ἀμονσία· ή γάρ; Hippolochum, qui cum laudibus atque cantibus amasium capere temptasset, difficiliorem eum ac minus placidum reddidit, stultius se gessisse appetit, at in Hippolochu Xenophontis ostenditur atque refutatur stultitia. Propositum enim, de quo agitur, idem est, nempe amicitia, simile autem utrumque, quod in Memorabilibus occurrit, venationis atque cantationum, redit in Lyside, immo etiam eadem interdum usurpantur vocabula, venationis denique praecipue imaginem Xenophonti, venandi inter primos studioso, curae fuisse loci insequentes (§§28 et 33) arguunt, ubi mentio eius iteratur, atque cantationes valde eidem placuisse repetitio ostendit earum §32, qua ita fertur: τὰς δέ γε Σειρῆνας ὅτι . . . πᾶσι πόρρωθεν ἐπῆδον, πάντας φασὶν ὑπομένειν καὶ ἀκούοντας αὐτῶν κηλεῖσθαι. Exquisitissimum videtur Platonis esse acumen atque in adversario discerendo eo magis eum desultasse putabimus, quia Xenophontem hominem ambitiosum, qui omnibus studiis campestribus se facile primum fore confideret, ut pessimum quasi venatorem depingendi occasio ei oblata est. Quanta esset ad iocandum alacritate, Plato paulo post iterum ostendit, nam cum Critobuli dubitationibus effete Xenophon hisce obviam iret (§22): ἀλλ' ὅμως διὰ τούτων πάντων ἡ φιλία διαδυομένη συνάπτει τοὺς καλούς τε

κάγαθούς, argute Plato et praecclare (τὸ καλὸν) ἔσικε, ait, μαλακῷ τινὶ καὶ λείφ καὶ λιπαρῷ, διὸ καὶ ἵσως ράδίως διολισθάνει καὶ διαδύεται ἡμᾶς.

Placitorum cognitione Ionicorum, Megarici mentione vocabuli, notionum denique profunditate Lysidem reliquis praecellere dialogis minoribus supra demonstravimus, grammatica ratione et divisione et argumento invenimus proxime eum ad Convivium accedere: huc adicias Memorabilium locum, qui maximi est ad amicitiam cognoscendam momenti, in Lyside commemorari. Atqui Memorabilia non ante a. 394 a. Chr. in lucem prodierunt, ergo Lysis ad a. 394 vel infra reiciendus est. Iam Convivii, quo amicitiae causa atque origo profundiore et prope divino indagatur ingenii flatu, quasi symphoniae aut concentus cuiusdam maioris pleniorisque Lysis sicut exordium fuerit et praeludium.

A. WIRTH.

NOTE.

FURTHER NOTES ON THE ORIGIN OF THE GERUND AND GERUNDIVE.

In my essay on 'The Origin of the Gerund and Gerundive' in the Amer. Journ. of Phil., vol. XV, part 2 (July, 1894), pp. 194-216¹ [with respect to which it may be mentioned that Mr. W. M. Lindsay, The Lat. Language (August, 1894), ch. VIII, §§94, 95 (cf. also the Addenda et Corrigenda on p. 660), holds an identical view with that which I there put forward], I gave in support of my theory a list of compounds from Sanskrit, Greek, Italic, etc., in which the first member is in the accusative case, governed as object by the second member (Class IV of Noun Compounds in Brugmann, Grundr. II, §10). Inasmuch as Brugmann (ib., §§32, 36) has given scarcely a single example of this sort of compound in Italic, and only about four in Greek, and considering that such compounds are a distinct support to my theory on the origin of the gerund and gerundive, it will be well to add the following examples to those already given (in A. J. P. ib., pp. 204 sqq.).

¹ Addenda et Corrigenda: p. 201, after *kárvu-do-s* omit the word 'supra'; for *vé-ji kṣe-ji* read *vé-si kṣe-si*; after "prá-si 'fill'" add "and many more in Whitney, Skr. Gram., §624"; p. 203, note 1, after "Skr. and Balto-Slavonic" add "see Brugmann, Gr. II, §108"; p. 205, after "Schweizer-Sidler, Latin Gr."² add "§48, f), p. 39"; for *vendex* read **vendex*; p. 206, after "Skutsch, De nominum Lat. compositione" add "p. 13, note 1," and see further below, p. 220; after "is qui aliquid semel arripit" add "v. Forcellini (edition 1871)"; p. 207, read **kred* for *kred*, and *mrdd-ti* *mrđikd-* *meržidika-* for *mrđid* *meržidika*, and on the etymology of the three latter words, see further below, p. 221, note 1; p. 208, for *mirss-ti* read *miřss-ti*; p. 211, add to "sāntvayāmāsa 'he hushed, soothed'" the following note: "With the formation of *sāntvayāmāsa* and the like we may perhaps compare the Homeric ákīv̄ éγéνοντο σωπ̄, where ákīv̄ is certainly the fossilised acc. of ákī (Il. III 95; VII 92, 398; VIII 28; IX 29, 430, 693; X 218, 313; XXIII 676; and Od. VII 154; VIII 234; XI 333; XIII 1; XVI 393; XX 320); from the frequency of its occurrence we should imagine that this Homeric phrase was older than the analogous ákīv̄ *ισαν*, which occurs, I think, only once (Il. IV 429); p. 215, for ēλ-o-μαι *Fēλ-o- μει-άω read ēλ-δo-μαι *Fēλ-δo- μει-δ-άω; p. 216, for "*da-om, *dhs-om" read "*da-om (or *dhs-om, in case the Latin gerund and gerundive contain Idg. *dh*, a view which is extremely unlikely, v. supra, pp. 198, 202 and 202, note 3)."

GREEK:

ξιφη-φάρος 'sword-bearing' beside **ξιφοφάρος** (: Lat. *ensifer*) ;
cf. A. J. P. ib., p. 202.

καρῆ-τόμος 'head-cutting, beheading' from **κάρα + τέμνω** (cf. καρη-
-κομόντες, A. J. P. ib., p. 205).

τερασκόπος from ***τερασ-σκοπος** (cf. Lat. *iustitium* from **ius-*
stitium, A. J. P. ib., p. 205) beside **τερατοσκόπος**.

δικασκόπος, on a Lesbian inscription [Cauer, Delect. Inscr. Graec. (1883), No. 428, p. 266, = C. I. G. 2166], possibly from ***δικασ-σκοπος** (cf. **τερασκόπος** above) from ***δικανσ-σκοπος** (cf. δικαστόλος from ***δικανσ-πολος**, A. J. P. ib., p. 204), or just conceivably from ***δικα**, accus. sing. of ***διξ** [: Skr. *diç-* (v. Brugmann, ib. II, §161), cf. Lat. **dicem*, gen. *dic-is* (seen in the phrases *dicis causa*, *dicis gratia*, *dicis ergo*), from nominative **dix* (all from */ deik-* 'to point out')] + -**σκοπος**.

θυοσ-κόος from **θύος** (accus. sing.) and **κο(F)έω**, lit. 'the man who heeds the sacrifice,' hence 'the sacrificing priest.' Osthoff, in Hübschmann, Das Idg. Vocalsystem (1885), Nachträge, p. 190, Brugmann, Gr. I (1886), §§439, 578, 589, G. Meyer, Gr. Gr.² (1886), §248, and Stoltz, Lat. Gr.² (1890), §15, Rem., p. 264, divide **θυοσκόος** differently—**θυο-**
-**σκόος**—regarding -**σκόος** beside **κοέω** as parallel to Idg. */ steg-*
beside Idg. */ teg-* 'to cover' (v. Brugmann, ib. I, §589).¹ If **θυοσκόος** could be considered by itself, there might perhaps be no objection to this explanation, for the form with *s* is established by Germanic: Goth. *us-skáu-s* 'provident, prudent,' O.H.G. *scouwōn* 'to look, view,' O.Icel. *skyn* 'insight' (beside the *s*-less form, which is represented by Skr. *kavi-s* 'seer,' *ā-kuvatē* 'intends,' Gk. **κο(F)έω** 'I mark, heed, observe,' Lat. *caveō*), but **θυοσκόος** must be considered in the light of our next example, **θυη-κόος**, which seems to prove conclusively that my division of the word —**θυοσ-κόος**—is correct.²

θυη-κόος (= **θυοσκόος** Hesych.) contains **θύη**, the accus. plur. of **θύος**; so also

¹ The passages in which Liddell and Scott (7th edition) mention this word are inconsistent, for on p. 686 we find **θυοσ-κόος** (s. h. v.), whereas on p. 820 the word is written **θυο-σκόος** (s. v. **κοέω**).

² It should be observed also that all the other Greek words preserving this root show the *s*-less form; e. g. *άμνοκῶν*, *εύρυκῶσα*, *ἀ-κούω*, and the proper names *Δηϊκῶν*, *Δημοκῶν*, *Εύρυκῶσα*, *Ιπποκῶν*, *ΔαΦοκόβων* [preserved by Priscian (v. Brugmann, ib. II, §60, p. 113, Engl. ed.)] *Δαοκῶν*, *Δαοκῶσα*.

θυη-δόχος beside θυοδόκος,
 θυη-πόλος, with which cf. δικασπόλος above,
 θυη-φάγος.

ITALIC:

Latin: *torunda*, Corp. gloss. 2, 202, No. 34 (v. Georges, Lexicon der Latein. Worts., s. v. *turunda*), and *turunda*, Cato, R. R. 89, Varro, R. R. 3, 9, 20, 'a ball of paste (for fattening geese),' from *torum*, accus. sing. of *torus* 'a swelling, protuberance,' + the suffix *-do-* from *√dō-* 'to give' (cf. *kalendae kalandae* in A. J. P. ib., pp. 206, 207), so that *torunda turunda* would strictly mean 'that which gives a swelling, fat-giving.' For *torunda* : *turunda* beside *torus*, cf. *rotundus* : *rutundus* (cited e. g. from Varro, R. R. 2, 7, 5; 2, 16, 19; v. Georges, ib., s. v. *rotundus*) beside *rota*. *merenda* f. 'an afternoon luncheon' from **merēm*, possibly an old infinitive of *mereo* (cf. A. J. P. ib., pp. 195, 196; and Lindsay, The Lat. Lang., ch. VIII, §95) + the suffix *-do-* from *√dō-* 'to give.' *merenda* (s. c. *cēna*) might thus mean literally 'the meal which gives the reward, deserts, earnings'; cf. Forcellini, s. h. v.: "Scalig. ad Varron. de R. R. dici putat a *merendo*, quod sit proprie cibus, qui datur aere merentibus, h. e. mercenariis." But this would scarcely be an attractive explanation. In considering *merenda* we must remember that it is an old word (v. the dictionaries), indeed a *very* old word, belonging to at least the fifth century B. C., if, as is probable, it is the same word as the Roman surname *Merenda*; we hear of T. Antonius Merenda, decemvir 450-449 B. C.; Q. Antonius T. f. Merenda, tribunus militum with consular authority, 422 B. C.; and also later (but still in the pre-literary period of Latin) Servius Cornelius Merenda, consul 274 B. C. Now, according to J. Schmidt, Pluralb., p. 432, the primary meaning of Lat. *mereo* is 'to get a (proper) share' [: Gk. *μείρομαι* (from **μερ-τομαι*) *μέρος*, etc.; v. Liddell and Scott (seventh edition), s. v. *μείρομαι*]. It would seem, then, that *merenda* was formed from *mereo* at a time when *mereo* still had its primary sense of 'share.'¹ Thus this word,

¹ That Lat. *merenda*, which thus literally means 'share-giving,' should have developed a meaning 'meal' may be closely paralleled by the Skr. compound *bhāga-dhēya-*, n., literally 'something to be placed or set as a share,' from Skr. *bhāg-*, m., 'a share' [from Skr. root *bhaj-* 'divide, share' from Idg. *√bhag-* 'to

handed down from a very old time, supports the remark of Lindsay (ib., ch. VIII, §95) that the surviving Latin compounds which show the first member in the accus. case governed by the second member 'may be relics of a mode of expression that prevailed much more widely in the pre-literary period of Latin.'¹

legiscrepa has been already mentioned in A. J. P. ib., p. 206, but without sufficient comment. *legiscrepa* = 'is qui legis (= leges) crepat,' just as *Lariscolus* = 'is qui Laris (= Lares) colit,' A. J. P. ib., p. 206; cf. Skutsch, De nominum Lat. compositione, p. 13, note 1. Compare Plaut., Mil. Glor. 3, 1, 56, i. e. l. 652 (not in the MSS, but reintroduced here from Servius ap. Verg. Aen. 1, 738; v. Lindemann on Plaut., l. c.), 'neque ego ad mensam publicas res clamo neque *leges crepo*.'

The following may be added to the instances of the accusative case compounded with the *finite verb*, A. J. P. ib., pp. 207 sqq.:—

'distribute' (v. Brugmann, Gr. I, §450)] + Skr. *dhēya* - 'to be placed or set' [the so-called 'gerundive' or 'future passive participle' from Skr. root *dhā-* 'to place, put' (v. Whitney, Skr. Gr., §§961 sqq., and Skr. Roots, Verb-forms, etc., p. 82) from Idg. **dhē-* 'to place, put'], which is found in RV. with two meanings, the earlier of which is 'the share which men offer to the gods,' i. e. 'the sacrificial meal,' RV. 262, 4; 878, 1; 940, 3; 1028, 1. [The second meaning, which may be mentioned in passing, is 'the share which the gods give to men,' i. e. 'prosperity, blessing,' RV. 705, 8; whence later the more general meaning 'lot, fate,' e. g. MBh. Nala, viii 6 *Āpi nō bhāgadhēyam syāt* 'also would it were our lot (sc. to save the king)' (Kellner), or 'our own fate is now in peril' (Monier-Williams).] Thus in both the compounds under consideration, though totally unconnected in form, we see the same development of meaning: in both the prior member of the compound (Lat. **merēm*, Skr. *bhāg-*) originally meant 'share,' and in both cases the compound has developed a meaning 'meal.' Compare also the development of meaning in the actual Idg. **bhāg-* 'to distribute' as represented in Greek, viz. *φαγ-εῖν* 'to eat' (Brugmann, Gr. I, §450). A similar transference of meaning may be seen in the following Greek forms: Gk. *δαιζω* 'I cleave asunder, divide,' *δαιομαι* mid. 'I distribute,' pass. 'am divided' (: Skr. *d-yd-ti* 'divides,' *dā-ya-tē* 'divides,' Brugmann, Gr. II, §707 ad fin.), whence *δαιρός* 'one who carves and portions out (esp. meat at table),' *δαις* 'meal, feast' (cf. *δαις έτον*, which is explained by some scholars as 'an equally divided meal, because each guest got his share,' Hom. Il. XV 95, etc.), *δαιτη* 'meal, feast,' *δαινῦμι* 'I give a meal, feast some one.'

¹If Lat. *torunda* and *merenda* are rightly thus derived as in the text, they afford, together with *kalendae kalandae*, A. J. P. ib., pp. 206, 207, a close parallel to Lat. *vēnundō pessundō*, on which v. A. J. P. ib., pp. 208, 209.

ARYAN:

Sanskrit¹ *namas-kr-* 'make a salutation, do homage,' originally two separate words, *námas* 'homage' + the Skr. root *kr-* 'to make' [cf. RV. x 34 (= 860), 8 *rājā cid ēbhyō náma it kṛṇōti* 'any king, whoe'er he be, to them does homage indeed'], became so entirely regarded as a single word that it came to be used as such and fell under one accent (compare the note on Lat. *crēdo*, Skr. *grād+dādhāmi* in A. J. P. ib., p. 207). This is proved by the so-called 'gerund' *namas-kṛtya* (AV.), *namas-kr̥tya* (MBh. Nala, iv 1 and 14), the general rule being that the 'gerund' from the *simple* root is formed with *-tvā* (whence *kṛtvā*), while the *compounded* root adds *-ya* or (if the root ends in a short vowel, as here) *-tya* (-*kṛtya*). Consequently *-kṛtya* is only found in compounds (v. Whitney, Skr. Roots, Verb-forms, etc., s. v. $\sqrt{1}$ *kr-*, p. 21), e. g. *aram-kṛtya* (RV.), *akhhali-kṛtya*² (RV.). Thus *namas-kr-* has become a genuine compound just as much as if it had been a compound of *kr-* with a prepositional prefix, e. g. *vi-* (cf. Whitney, Skr. Gr., §§990, 990 b, 992).

GREEK:

θυοσ-κέω 'burn a sacrifice, make a burnt offering,' Hesych. Cf. the compounds cited above: *θυοσ-κός* *θυη-κός* (-*κός* from *κοέω*) *θυη-δόχος* *θυη-πόλος* *θυη-φάγος*. Mr. A. Sidgwick on Aesch. Agam. 87 [where, in place of the MSS *θυοσκεῖς* (the first : of which is in an erasure, according to Dr. A. W. Verrall on Aesch. Agam., l. c., critical note), he accepts *θυοσκεῖς* (from *θυοσκέω*), the emendation of Turnebus, a reading which has, I think, more to recommend it than

¹ In discussing Skr. *mṛḍd-ti mṛḍikd-*, Avest. *merəžidika-*, A. J. P. ib., pp. 207, 208, I did not express my meaning with sufficient clearness; I should more correctly have written: Skr. *mṛḍd-ti* 'is gracious, pardons,' *mṛḍikd-*, n. 'grace, pardon,' Avest. *merəžidika-*, n. 'grace, pardon' are to be referred back to an old syntactical combination, either (1) **mṛ̥g̥* (from $\sqrt{mer̥g̥}$ 'to wipe off': Skr. *mṛ̥j-d-ti* 'wipes off, cleanses from guilt,' Avest. *marəž-a-iti* 'wipes, cleanses') + *dō-* 'grant a purity from sins,' or (2) **mṛ̥g̥* (i. Skr. *mṛ̥g̥-ya-tē* 'forgets,' *mṛ̥g̥yatē* 'bears patiently, excuses, pardons,' Lith. *mižsz-ti* 'to forget') + *dō-* (by assimilation **mṛ̥g̥ dō-*) 'grant a forgetting, excuse' (v. Brugmann, Gr. I, §404, 1, and in Idg. Forsch., vol. I, pp. 171, 172; and note that the English translation of the former passage by Joseph Wright is incorrect and misleading).

² By a printer's error this word is written *akhhali-kṛtya* in Whitney, Skr. Gr., §990 b.

θύεις καίεις (the reading of Prien, accepted by Dr. Verrall)] considers -κέω (: θυοο-κέω) to be very closely connected with καίω 'I burn.'

In conclusion it will be well to touch on Prof. Fay's theory of 'The Latin Gerundive -^ondo-' which was published in A. J. P. ib., pp. 217 sqq. Prof. Fay there assumes *dhāi as the original form from which we are to derive Lat. -dae, e. g. in Lat. *ferendae* from Idg. *bhernydhāi (: Skr. *bharadhāi). But such a view takes no account whatever of the Umbr.-Osc. forms, which cannot possibly represent Idg. dh (cf. my remarks in A. J. P. ib., pp. 198, 202 and 202, note 3); unless, therefore, we are to regard the Umbr.-Osc. gerundive as borrowed from Latin (a view which does not seem very probable), Prof. Fay's theory must inevitably fall to the ground.¹

ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, ENG.
March, 1895.

LIONEL HORTON-SMITH.

¹ Since the above was written, Prof. Fay, in the A. J. P., vol. XVI, part 1 (April, 1895), has referred to my view on the representation of Idg. dh in Italic (A. J. P., vol. XV, pp. 196, 202 and 202, note 3) as being against his theory of the origin of the Latin gerundive, and, in order to maintain his own view, has endeavoured to prove that Idg. -ndh->Osc.-Umbr. -nþ->-nd->-nn- || -n-. But the examples adduced do not seem at all convincing. The -de of Lat. *inde*, *unde* and (I may add) O.Lat. *quande* *quande* are almost certainly to be referred to Idg. *de, together with Gk. -de in δ-δε ἐνθέτεις and ἐνθά-δε (cf. Per Persson in Idg. Forsch., vol. II, pp. 219, 223, 238, 241; Lindsay, The Lat. Lang., ch. IX, §10, p. 570). Supposing that this (to my mind the most probable) view is correct, it follows that Umbr. *enom* || *ennom* 'then,' if kindred with Lat. *inde*, Umbr. *pone* || *ponne* 'cum,' if identical with Lat. *unde*, Umbr. *pane*, if identical with O.Lat. *quande*, contain not Idg. dh, but Idg. d (cf. Per Persson, ib., pp. 219, 240, 241. Brugmann also, in his Grundr., vol. I, §207, IV, §1103, 3, Rem., seems to regard O.Lat. *quande* Umbr. *pane* as containing Idg. d). The d of Lat. *endo* || *indu* seems beyond all doubt to represent Idg. d, not Idg. dh; cf. Gk. ἐνδο-θι ἐνδο-θεις ἐνδον (Brugmann, Gr. Gr.², §201, p. 221; id., Grundr., vol. IV, §1103, 3, Rem.; Lindsay, ib., ch. IX, §27, p. 582). The same is the case with Lat. *quando* (cf. Per Persson, ib., pp. 219, 219 note 3 ad fin., 238; Lindsay, ib., ch. X, §12, p. 608). I therefore feel compelled to regard Prof. Fay's suggestion, that Idg. -ndh- gave Osc.-Umbr. -nþ->-nd->-nn- || -n-, as unproven. Nor, I think, does his concluding observation, that "there was an Aryan doublet to ndh, viz. nd, represented in Greek πνθηήν || πνθαξ," give him much help; for it is thereby implied that the gerundive, which was purely an Italic development (v. A. J. P., vol. XV, p. 195), may have had two quite separate starting-points—one in Latin, the other in Umbr.-Osc.; this view seems very unlikely, especially when the identity of the gerundival construction shewn by Early Latin and Oscan (v. A. J. P., vol. XV, pp. 202, 203) is brought into consideration.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Plato's Republic. Edited with Notes and Essays by the late B. JOWETT and LEWIS CAMPBELL. Vol. I. Text. Vol. II. Essays. Vol. III. Notes. Oxford, At the Clarendon Press. New York, Macmillan & Co., 1894.

The history of this edition, as recounted in Professor Campbell's preface, is exceedingly interesting. It was originally undertaken by Professor Jowett about the year 1855 for the series in which Professor Campbell's editions of the *Theaetetus*, *Sophist*, and *Statesman* appeared. Diverted from his task by the publication of *Essays and Reviews*, Professor Jowett returned to it in 1863, only to conceive the design of a translation first of the *Republic* and then of all the Platonic dialogues, which occupied him until 1871 and was followed by his translations of Thucydides and the *Politics* of Aristotle. The commentary on the *Republic* was never wholly abandoned, however, but had been gradually brought to completion and copied out, when in 1875 Professor Campbell was taken into partnership by the author. During the ensuing 18 years a text was adopted, and the commentary, after repeated revisions, by each of the editors, was made ready for its final transcription. But before the work could be published, Professor Jowett died, solemnly commanding to his associate the completion of the undertaking which had occupied him at intervals for forty years.

Is the result proportionate to all this labor, to the expectations aroused by the association of two such names, and, if the sordid suggestion may be pardoned, to the ten dollars which these three sumptuous volumes demand from the scholar's scanty purse? It would be ungracious, in view of all that is here offered us, to press these questions. And yet one must confess to a slight sense of dissatisfaction. The work is too costly and ponderous to meet the long-felt want of a convenient textbook for college classes, and despite its many excellencies, the scholar and historian of thought cannot feel that it is a definitive and monumentally 'exacted' achievement, when they compare it with Munro's *Lucretius* or with Jebb's *Sophocles*.

One naturally turns first to the essays. It would be unfair to insist on a certain feeling of disappointment that accompanied their first perusal. The announcement that the Jowett and Campbell *Republic* would include a volume of essays led us to expect a series of studies embodying the life-long reflections of the master on the great work which had preoccupied his attention for so many years—philosophical studies that should bring out the relation of the speculations of the *Republic* to Hellenic and to universal ethics and politics, historical studies that should trace in some detail the unparalleled influence that this book has exercised through the ages on the minds of thoughtful men. But the successive postponements of this edition to other tasks, till the work was finally interrupted by death, have reduced Professor

Jowett's contribution to one slight essay 'On the Text of Greek Authors,' and it is no disparagement of the useful and interesting studies with which Professor Campbell has filled the breach to say that they do not quite meet the measure of those earlier anticipations.

What can be said of Professor Jowett's entertaining essay 'On the Text of Greek Authors'? It is a strong plea for conservatism in the admission into the text of readings unwarranted by good manuscript authority, a subtle and impressive statement of the inherent limitations of human faculty in divinatory criticism, a vigorous warning against the extravagances of conjectural emendation and the futilities of collations of the punctuation and spelling of third-rate manuscripts. It is interesting reading for the scholar, and would be instructive though somewhat misleading to the tiro. Here and there it offers one of those sage *sententiae* with which the master never failed to adorn any subject he touched; e. g. "An art or kind of knowledge which is attractive and at the same time wanting in certain tests of truth is always liable to fall into the hands of projectors and inventors"; or this: "A labour which is wholly disproportioned to the result is apt to infect the judgment and to pervert the wider comparison of other branches of knowledge, which is the safeguard against the errors of exclusive study." It is stimulating, suggestive and useful as a corrective to extreme views. But its scientific value for practical guidance is *nil*. For the admissibility of any given proposed emendation is a matter of particular probability slightly affected by plausible generalities or analogies derived from the blunders of Bentley or the difficulties of emending Shakspere, but hinging on niceties of Greek scholarship with which Professor Jowett's acquaintance remained imperfect to the end.

Professor Campbell's first essay is a rather loose and rambling study of the structure of the Republic and its relation to other dialogues. He begins with an enumeration of the main subdivisions of the Republic as indicated by Plato himself, and a brief résumé, allusive rather than lucidly expository, of the plot. He then takes up and refutes Krohn's view that the metaphysical digression in books V-VIII was composed later than the Socratic books I-IV and VIII-X, and inserted with junctures which the Teutonic critical eye can still detect. I do not propose to take this controversy seriously. Common sense tells us that the Republic was a long time composing, and may have been often interpolated and revised by Plato before his death. Those who have a competent intelligence of Plato's thought know that, while his moods and the stress of emphasis laid on particular aspects of truth varied at different periods of his life, there are few, if any, important Platonic conceptions of which distinct traces cannot be found in the Republic. The essential unity of the Republic is best brought out by a positive exposition of its central thought, such as I have attempted elsewhere. The possibilities of misinterpreting Plato are infinite. It is idle to try to lop off the Hydra heads of ingenious misapprehension by controversy. The remedy lies in broader philosophic and literary culture and in closer study of text and context. For the rest, the opinions concerning the Platonic philosophy of a critic who (like Krohn) maintains that the Republic is the earliest genuine extant dialogue may be safely disregarded.

Professor Campbell's remarks on the unity of the Republic are sensible and convincing. I fail to see the point, however, of his concession (p. 8): "nor in

the series νοῦς διάνοια πίστις εἰκασία is there any recognition of the other series νοῦς θυμός and ἐπιθυμία." What of it? One might as well observe that in Sully's Psychology the series cognition, feeling, will contains no recognition of the series reasoning, judgment, imagination, sensation. If a connecting link is needed, however, Phaedo 83 C D supplies it. Plato held that pleasure, pain and desire (*ἐπιθυμία*) constrain mankind to take their objects, the objects of *πίστις* and *εἰκασία*, for the primary realities. Professor Campbell's suggestion that ἔμπεπτώκαμεν (IV 435 C) and διανενεύκαμεν (441 C) are anticipations of the image of the wave in the disputed books is, I think, fanciful. They are unconscious anticipations, at the best, and prove nothing as to date of composition.

By way of supplement to this discussion, Professor Campbell takes up the interpretation of the allegory of the cave at the beginning of book VII. Many of his isolated remarks are of interest. But he has not grasped the main clue—the truth that the Idea of Good is not primarily an ontological but an ethical conception, and that it is therefore idle to bring it into relation with an assumed ontological scale of the ideas. Not recognizing this, he falls into the usual error with regard to Plato's mathematical illustrations, and fails to perceive, although it is explicitly affirmed by Plato, that the intermediate place occupied by mathematical conceptions here is in the educational and propaedeutic, not in the absolute ontological, scale. As I have elsewhere illustrated this point more fully, I will here confine myself to another but kindred topic. Professor Campbell, like many others, finds difficulty in reconciling the ontology of book X with the "more advanced ontology" of books VI and VII, and thinks (p. 27) that the clear conception of Being, etc., "as ideas of relation which comes out at Theaetetus 184, 185 could hardly have been possible while Plato held the doctrine of ideas in the crude and undeveloped form which is still implied in the Republic, and which the Parmenides for the first time showed to be unsatisfactory." But I am unable to find any thought in the Parmenides not distinctly foreshadowed in the Republic. In both dialogues it is a postulate of dialectical method that every conceptual unit of thought expressed or capable of expression by a general term should be an absolute 'idea,' whether it represent a relation, a 'natural kind,' an ethical ideal, a manufactured, or a mean and sordid object. In both it is recognized that this is a hard doctrine, involving us in modes of speech that strike harshly on unaccustomed ears, and, when we attempt to crystallize it into ontology, in paradoxes and antinomies. More particularly the seeming incompatibility of the absolute unity of the ideas with their intercommunion (1) with concrete things, (2) with each other, is expressly remarked upon in the Republic. The famous argument of the 'third man' which is supposed to mark the 'crisis' of the Parmenides and the necessity for a reconstitution of the doctrine of ideas is explicitly stated in the tenth book of the Republic. What other interpretation is it possible to put upon the words (597 C) ὁ μὲν δὴ θεός, εἴτε οὐκ ἐβούλετο, εἴτε τις ἀνάγκη ἐπῆν μὴ πλέον ἡ μίαν ἐν τῇ φύσει ἀπεργάσασθαι αὐτὸν κλίνην, οὐτως ἐπούσθε μίαν μόνον αὐτὴν ἐκείνην δὲ ἐστι κλίνη· διὸ δὲ τουαῖται ἡ πλείονς οὐτε ἐφτεινθησαν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐτε μὴ φύσιν. Πῶς δὴ; ἐφη. 'Οτι, ἣν δ' ἔγω, εἰ διὸ μόνας ποιήσει, πάλιν ἀν μία ἀναφανεῖη, ἢς ἐκείναι ἀν αὐτούφθεται τὸ εἶδος ἔχονται, καὶ εἰη ἀν δὲ ἐστι κλίνη ἐκείνη, ἄλλ' οὐδὲ αἱ διὸ? Compare

with this Parmenides 132 E: *οὐκ ἄρα οἶν τέ τι τῷ εἰδεῖ δύοιον εἶναι, οὐδὲ τὸ εἶδος ἄλλως εἰ δὲ μή, παρὰ τὸ εἶδος ἀεὶ ἄλλο ἀναφανῆσεται εἶδος κτλ.* I do not see how it is possible, after attention has been called to these passages, for scholars to affirm that the discovery of the argument of the 'third man' drove Plato to a revision of the entire doctrine of ideas. Lastly, there are at least two passages in the Republic which contain the germ of all the antinomies of the Parmenides concerning the one. (1) The passage in 436 E where such quibbling ambiguities are anticipated in a tone of weary familiarity and deprecated, and (2) the passage on ideal numbers, 526 A: *περὶ ποίων ἀριθμῶν διαλέγεσθε, ἐν οἷς τὸ ἐν οἷον ὑμεῖς ἀξιοῦτε ἔστιν, Ισον τε ἔκαστον πᾶν παντὶ καὶ οὐδὲ συμκρὸν διαφέρον, μόριόν τε ἔχον ἐν ἑαυτῷ οὐδέν.* With which compare, e. g., Parmenides 159 C: *οὐδὲ μὴν μόριά γε ἔχειν φαμὲν τὸ ὡς ἀληθῶς ἐν.* The Parmenides, then, is simply the attempt to sum up once for all, in compact, symmetrical form, those inherent ambiguities of language or ultimate *ἀπορία* of metaphysics which Plato was always aware of, but which he chose merely to indicate and dismiss when engaged in predominantly ethical or sociological discussions.

Professor Campbell's discussion of the relation of the Republic to the other Platonic dialogues, the most important topic of which has just been considered, makes no claim to system or completeness. The analogies between the Gorgias and the Republic are clearly, though not very subtly, indicated. But surely it is over-refining to quote the playful remark *οὐ δὲ πλεονεξίαν οἱει δεῖν ἀσκεῖν, γεωμετρίας γὰρ ἀμελεῖς* (Gorg. 508 A) as evidence that "the Gorgias also agrees with the Republic in assigning an intellectual or scientific basis for morality" (p. 22). The discussion of the relation of the Republic to the Parmenides, Theaetetus and Sophist is vitiated, as I have said, by Professor Campbell's failure, in common with many other critics, to grasp the simple meaning of the doctrine of ideas. He sees in the concluding passage of Republic VI an ascending scale to an absolute *ἀνυπόθετον*, instead of a dialectical method of coordinating all ethical and social conceptions by the systematic regression on the part of disciplined minds to some ideal of good and happiness postulated as final. The image, frequent throughout Plato and Aristotle, by which the universal is spoken of as a whole and its subordinated species or concretes as parts, presents a serious problem of ontology to him. He asks whether the ideas are Forms of Thought and the higher related to the lower as the Ideas of the Reason to the Categories of the Understanding, with no apparent recognition of the utter irrelevancy to Plato's real thought of the decorative Kantian literary analogies, or of the fact that the best modern thought regards these distinctions as purely artificial, and is therefore pleased not to find them in Plato. He says that Plato is nowhere distinctly conscious of the difference between a genus and a category, but has not entertained the thought that Plato's freedom from futile distinctions which ultimate psychological analysis cannot verify is one of his chief titles to honor.

This essay is supplemented by a long and interesting excursus in which Professor Campbell sums up, not without legitimate complacency, the cumulative evidence brought by the statistics of Dittenberger, Schanz, Ritter and others in support of the position defended, against Stallbaum and Zeller, in his editions of the Theaetetus, Sophist and Statesman, that these dialogues,

together with the *Philebus* and the *Parmenides*, form a group later than the *Republic* and intermediate between it and the *Laws*.

Essay II on the text may be considered later. The essay 'On Plato's Use of Language' fills nearly 200 pages. Nothing beyond a brief characterization of it can be attempted here. A short, well-written introduction brings out one of the distinctive features of Plato's style as a whole, the peculiar combination it presents of conversational liveliness and freedom with punctilious dialectical precision. Then follows a long chapter in grammar constructed much on the lines of the Introductory Essay on Language in Professor Campbell's *Sophocles*. It is a convenient, though not exhaustive nor especially illuminating, presentation of the more notable peculiarities of Plato's syntax and idiom. The material is in the main a résumé of the grammatical notes in the commentary supplemented from Riddell's *Digest* and Goodwin's *Greek Moods and Tenses*. The present reviewer is incompetent to discuss it in detail, as he has never been able to comprehend the infinite gusto with which Greek scholars discuss and record for the hundredth time, with individual innovations of terminology, the 'aorist of the immediate past,' the 'philosophic imperfect,' the 'perfect of fixed habit,' the 'assimilated optative,' the 'exegetical infinitive,' the 'inner accusative,' the 'dative of the person interested,' the 'predicative adverb,' and other familiar syntactical specimens which to his duller sense have been sufficiently embalmed or stuffed and set up for inspection once for all in the indispensable collections of Kühner and Goodwin. Exhaustive historical statistic such as laborious Germany gives us, the delicate observation of neglected niceties of usage such as we find in the notes of Prof. Jebb's *Sophocles*, the penetrating analysis of conventional syntactical categories for which we look to Professor Gildersleeve,—these are different matters. But the miscellaneous yet incomplete collections of familiar constructions and idioms with which so many editions of the classics are now introduced merely disabuse the student to the intelligent consultation of his grammar.

These strictures apply only in part to the essay before us. The treatment of the particles offers much which the student could extract from his grammar or lexicon only with difficulty and by inference, if at all. And the section on imperfect constructions, changes of construction and anacoluthon will greatly lighten the task of the teacher of the *Republic*.

Part II, Platonic Diction, begins with a laborious, though necessarily incomplete, study of Plato's vocabulary. Tables constructed like those in Schmid's *Atticismus* are given of Plato's new derivatives or compounds, with appended citation from Stephanus of the authors (without chapter and verse) who employed them after Plato. These are followed by columns of vernacular words (partially illustrated from Aristophanes and the older comedy), of picturesque terms borrowed or imitated from poetry, of philosophic metaphors and of etymological puns. Such collections are interesting and suggestive, but they prove nothing that Macaulay's scholar would not learn in a far more natural way by "reading Plato with his feet on the fender" for a day or two, and they are not exact or complete enough to supply a basis for a final treatment of Plato's style. Lastly we have a section on Plato's philosophical terms, subdivided into metaphysical, psychological and dialectical words. It

is not really possible to expound the terminology of a thinker like Plato apart from the systematic analysis of his philosophy or of some portion of it. For his terms take their meaning from the context, and the possibilities of misapprehension when they are studied in isolation are infinite. With this reservation, Professor Campbell's somewhat desultory observations will be found helpful. I fear, however, that in the eleven pages devoted to *eidōs* and *idéa* the student will be unable to see the wood for the trees. Why not say at once that *eidōs* means (1) concretely the 'look' of a thing, the typical aspect, "the look that expresses a single meaning of nature" (Martineau), or (2) abstractly the hypostatic objective reality postulated as underlying every general term or conceptual unit, or (3) the logical class or genus, or (4) any shade between these meanings?

The discussion of *elvai*, *ōv*, *oīσia*, etc., is superior to that found in Peipers' *Ontologia Platonica* in that it fills two pages instead of two hundred. A tacit refutation follows (but this is slaying the slain) of Mr. Jackson's 'Later Theory of Ideas' in the guise of a review of Plato's indiscriminate employment, at all periods, of the manifold terms for 'assimilation to' or 'participation' in the ideas. The footnote on p. 313 is an excellent illustration of the misconceptions that are likely to arise when Platonic passages are taken in falsifying isolation. It runs: "In Parm. 133 D there are two stages in the descent from the ideas to individuals, (1) ὁμοίωσις, subsisting between the idea and its ὁμοίωμα or concrete type, and (2) μέθεξις τοῦ ὁμοίωματος." A literal and mechanical interpretation of the passage referred to would seem to confirm this interpretation. It would, nevertheless, seriously mislead the student. Parmenides is arguing that, in the case of relative terms, ideal relatives will correlate only with ideal relatives and concretes only with concretes. Jones is (slave) of Smith. Smith is (master) of Jones. But Jones has no relation to master in the abstract (ideal), nor has Smith to the abstract or ideal slave. The expression of the thought is rendered more vivid by the personification inherent in Greek style. Absolute *deontoreía* is in heaven and has no communication with the *deontoreía παρ' ἡμῖν*. In this last statement the necessities of language have driven Plato into apparent contradiction. His hypothesis is not really stateable in language. It is impossible, as the *þeontes* of the *Theaetetus* are admonished, to banish general terms from the most concrete forms of expression. The statement 'Smith is (master) of Jones' not only affirms a relation between the concretes Jones and Smith, but predicates the general term 'master' of Smith, or in Platonic languages makes Smith participate in (*μετέχειν*) *deontoreía*. But this, on the present hypothesis, necessitates a doubling of *deontoreía*, since ideal *deontoreía* stands aloof in incommunicable isolation. It is a mistake to crystallize into rigid metaphysical dogma this concession to the exigencies of language. But no critic who possesses a sense of humor will care to run down and analyze in this pedantic fashion many such misconceptions. Plato can be rightly interpreted only by a positive systematic exposition of his thought, with its entire logical and emotional setting.

Professor Campbell's remarks on the 'psychological' terms *alθησις*, *φαντασία*, *διάνοια*, etc., require no comment. The discussion of *ὑπόθεσις* under dialectical terms seems to owe a debt to the note on Συλλογισμοὶ ἐξ ὑπόθεσεως in A. J. P.

X 4. Professor Campbell has apparently changed his mind with regard to *Theaetet.* 157 B C: *φ δὴ ἀθροίσματι ἀνθρωπὸν τε τίθενται καὶ λίθον καὶ ἔκαστον ζῷον τε καὶ εἶδος.* In his edition of the *Theaetetus* he prefers to understand the *ἀθροίσμα* of the union of many predicates in the universal. Here (p. 337) he takes it to mean that "each substance is a bundle or aggregate of transient attributes or presentations." A passage in *Sextus Empiricus* (p. 457, Bekker) favors this latter interpretation: *εἰπερ οὖν ἐστι τι ὅλον οἷον ἀνθρωπὸς ἵππος φυτὸν ναῦς (ταῦτα γὰρ ὅλων ὄντα) ἡτοι ἐπερόν ἐστι τῶν μερῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ κατ' ιδίαν ἕπόστασιν καὶ οὐσιαν νοεῖται, ἢ τὸ ἀθροίσμα τῶν μερῶν λέγεται τυγχάνειν ὅλον.*

The text of this edition was originally based on that of Baiter's edition of 1881, but has been gradually revised into closer conformity with the text of Hermann. The various readings given in the footnotes are taken mainly from Paris. A, which Professor Campbell has recollated himself, and from which he has gleaned a number of hitherto unnoticed details; Venetus II, collated with Bekker's text for the purposes of this edition by Professor C. Castellani, of the Library of St. Mark, and Cesena M, collated for this edition by Professor Enrico Rostagno.

Professor Campbell's laborious essay on the text begins with a description of the chief manuscripts. This is followed by an elaborate argument based on the agreements and divergencies of M, A and II, in support of the position that M is the best of the inferior MSS, and that where it differs from the first hand of A and agrees with II it has not been emended, as Schanz held, from a MS of the family of II, but is an independent witness. A short treatise on the chief causes of textual errors is then given, with ample illustration from the MSS of Plato. He then takes up the subject of textual emendation, discussing in order the still doubtful passages of the *Republic*, the passages in which this text rests on emendations, the most important conjectures of Cobet, Madvig and others not received into the present text, and certain suggestions and recommendations of his own. The essay closes with some interesting remarks in the vein of Professor Jowett's Introductory Essay, though less extreme in tone, on the difficulties and dangers of textual criticism generally. Four appendices give, first a collation of the present text with Paris. A, second a list of the errors of the first hand in Paris. A with the source of their correction, third a correction of the errors and omissions in Bekker's collations of II and E, and fourth a discussion of Cesena MS M by E. Rostagno. There is something disheartening in the exiguity of the outcome of all this toil, and one is tempted to repeat Professor Jowett's heretical dictum, that "such enquiries have certainly been carried far enough and need no longer detain us from more important subjects." There is really not much to be done with the text of Plato. The game must be played strictly according to the rules, but when it is played out we feel that it was hardly worth the midnight oil. The text of this edition must have cost Professor Campbell a considerable portion of the leisure hours of the last two or three years. Yet, as he himself says at the close of his interesting, if discursive, essay: "Were the corruptions and interpolations of the text of the *Republic* as numerous as recent scholars have imagined, the difference of meaning involved would be still infinitesimal. Some feature of an image might be obscured, or some idiomatic phrase enfeebled, but Plato's philosophy would remain uninjured."

Of the twelve passages which Professor Campbell regards as still open to suspicion (vol. II, p. 115), only two affect the sense even slightly. 387 C φρίττειν δὴ ποιεῖ ὡς οἰεται, for which our editors read ὡς οἴδω τε (which they refer to *g*, and the correction of Par. A by *g*, not to Par. A, as hitherto), rejecting Hermann's more vigorous δοῦ ἔτη and not venturing to insert in the text L. C.'s suggestion, ὡς ἔτεά. In IX 581 E, τῆς ἥδονῆς οὐ πάνυ πόρρω, there is no real difficulty if we accept, with nearly all editors, Graser's τι οἰώμεθα and place interrogation-points after μανθάνοντα and πόρρω. Professor Jowett would retain ποιώμεθα and take the words τῆς ἥδονῆς οὐ πάνυ πόρρω as ironical. I do not care to try to convert any one whose perceptions of Greek style do not tell him that this is impossible. Professor Campbell's suggestion, τῆς ἀληθινῆς, of which he thinks ἥδονῆς a substituted gloss, does not affect the meaning and supplies a plausible remedy for the seemingly objectionable repetition of ἥδονῆς. But it is, I think, unnecessary. The Platonic philosopher thinks that sensual pleasures are no pleasures. Cf. Philebus 44 C ὅστε καὶ αὐτὸ τούτῳ αἰτής τὸ ἐπαγωγὸν γοήτευμα οὐχ ἥδονὴν εἶναι. The difficulties in 388 E, 359 C, 567 E, 590 D, 603 C, 615 C, are too trifling for further debate. 439 E ποτὲ ἀκόντιας τι πιστεῖν τούτῳ is certainly awkward. L. C.'s suggestion, οὐ πιστεῖν τούτῳ, with changed reference of τούτῳ, equally so. 533 E δ ἀν μόνον δηλοῖ πρὸς τὴν ἔξιν σαφῆνεια δ λέγει ἐν ψυχῇ is impossible, and the ingenuity is wasted that is spent upon it in the commentary to this result: "An expression which may indicate with a clearness proportioned to the mental condition that of which it speaks as existing in the mind." All we want is the thought of Charmides 163 D δήλον δὲ μόνον ἐφ' δ τι ἀν φέρει τοίνουμα δ τι ἀν λέγγει, and that is given by the only tolerable text yet proposed, that of Hermann: ἀλλ' δ ἀν μόνον δηλοῖ πρὸς τὴν ἔξιν σαφῆνεια δ λέγει ἐν ψυχῇ (ἀρκέσει), which is ignored by our editors and which is indeed too remote from the MSS to be susceptible of proof. In 562 B the unwarranted ἵπερκλοντος, which B. J. defends *more suo*, may be emended by deleting ἵπερ or by L. C.'s plausible suggestion, πον πλοῦτος. In 568 D, L. C.'s suggestion, πωλούμενων, is as easy a way as any of securing the required meaning which grammar forbids us to extract from ἀποδομένων.

Of the 29 passages in which the present text relies on conjectures by various hands, none affects the sense except possibly the obvious παισὶν for πᾶσιν (494 B and 431 C), Schneider's palmary καὶ ἐτίμα μάλιστα for καὶ ἔτι μάλιστα, 554 A, Graser's τι οἰώμεθα, 581 D, Vermehren's χαίρων καὶ δυσχεραίνων, which restores concinnity in 401 E, and L. C.'s διὰ τὸ bis, 440 C, for διὰ τὸ, an emendation which was pencilled on the margin of my Teubner text some years ago. The others restore a paragogic ν or a dropped ἀν or an iota subscript, or smooth out an anacoluthon. Professor Campbell himself suggests some fifteen emendations in addition to the one admitted to the text (vol. II, p. 123). Three or four of these have already been considered. Of the others the most important are the (in the context) cacophonous ἄξιως, 496 A, for ἄξιον, which is better omitted altogether, with Hermann; ἐγγὺς τι τείνειν τῶν τοῦ σώματος for εἰναι, 518 D, which is clever and would commend itself but for a lingering doubt whether the phrase had not a half-humorous suggestion in Plato's usage; and η οὐκ (sic *g*) . . . ἀλλοίαν τε [Stallb. for τοι] φήσεις, 500 A. It is unnecessary to follow Professor Campbell in his recension of the superfluous emendations of

Cobet, Madvig and others not admitted into the text. The man who prints an emendation that is not required but is merely possible Greek in the context is a thief of our time and should be suppressed by a conspiracy of silence. I could wish, however, that our editors had followed Hermann in admitting Nägelsbach's *ἐτι ἀδύναμία*, supported by a quotation from Iamblichus, for *ἐπ' ἀδύναμίᾳ* in 532 B C. *ἐπ' ἀδύναμίᾳ βλέπειν* 'to look powerlessly,' i. e. 'to be without the power to see,' as our editors construe, after Schneider, makes large demands on our faith in the flexibility of Greek idiom, and Stallbaum's "bei dem Unvermögen zu sehen" is not much better. Moreover, the *ἐτι* adds a touch that is needed; cf. 516 A *πρότον μὲν*, etc. For the rest, all this matter, with much besides, is conscientiously repeated in the commentary, though exhaustiveness is after all not attained, and many useful readings recorded in Stallbaum or Hermann are ignored. I have noted the following points, which might (without much profit) be indefinitely added to. In 332 E no notice is taken of the plausible *προπολεμεῖν* approved by Ast and Stephanus. In 365 B *ἔὰν μὴ καὶ δοκῶ*, which has sufficient MS authority, is better than *ἔὰν καὶ μὴ δοκῶ*. The thought is: 'I shall profit nothing from *being* just unless I also seem' rather than 'I shall profit nothing from being just (even) if I seem the opposite.' What our editors mean by saying that *ἔὰν καὶ μὴ δοκῶ* is more idiomatic I cannot guess. In 365 D *καὶ (οὐδὲ)* Jowett and Campbell *ἥμιν μελητέον τοῦ λαυθάνειν*, I think the consensus of the MSS can be defended, despite the necessity for a negative that nearly all editors have felt here. The argument of the entire passage runs: There exist (1) political clubs *ἐπὶ τῷ λαυθάνειν* and (2) teachers of persuasion who will enable us to evade punishment if detected. But, you will say, we cannot (1) elude or (2) constrain the gods. The answer is (transferring the question to the higher sphere), as for gods, perhaps (1) they do not exist or are careless of mankind, or (2) can be persuaded or bought off by prayers and ceremonies. Accordingly, we must either (1) try to escape detection, as on the previous supposition, before the gods were introduced into the argument, or (2) invoke priests and hierophants as in the former case teachers of the art of persuasion. The logic of *καὶ ἥμιν μελητέον τοῦ λαυθάνειν* is loose, but it is quite as good as that of *εἰ μὴ εἰσὸν* as an answer to *θεοὺς οὐτε λαυθάνειν δυνατόν*, and there is no need of reading *οὐδὲ*, *οὐκον*, *τί* or *ἀμελητέον*. The *καὶ* of *καὶ ἥμιν* indicates an illogical but perfectly natural antithesis between 'us' on the present supposition and the members of the political clubs above. In 378 D our editors follow Baiter in punctuating after *γρανοί*. The antithesis thus secured between *παιδία εἰθῆς* and *πρεσβυτέρους γιγνομένους* (*λὰν γενομένους?*) favors this. The awkwardness of the four times repeated ambiguous *καὶ*, and the difficulty of the dative with *λογοποεῖν* and the emphasis thus lost of the triplet *καὶ γέροντοι καὶ γρανοί καὶ πρεσβυτέρους γιγνομένους*, are against it. 397 A, L. C. accepts Madvig's (Schneider's?) *μιμήσεται* for *διηγήσεται*, *adversante* B. J., but *διηγήσεται* seems to be required by the balance of the sentence: *πάντα τε μᾶλλον διηγήσεται καὶ . . . οἴησεται διότε πάντα ἐπιχειρήσει μιμεῖσθαι*. 442 C *σοφὸν δέ γε ἔκεινῷ τῷ σμικρῷ μέρει, τῷ δὲ ἡρῷ τὸν αὐτῷ καὶ ταῦτα παρήγγελλεν ἔχον αὐτὸν κάκεινο, etc.* Our editors seem to feel no difficulty in the *τῷ δ*, etc., nor do they note the omission of *τῷ* by Par. K and Mon. A simple remedy would be to omit the *τῷ* before *δ* and insert it after *παρήγγελλεν*, reading *τῷ ἐχειν*. In 451 E, in

reading *δοτε εὖ* (for *οἴ*) *με παραμύθει*, our editors, here as elsewhere, overestimate the possibilities of Socratic irony. 500 A. In arguing against the repetition of *ἄλλοιαν* in a different sense, our editors should not have ignored the reading of M, *ἄλλ' οἰαν* (recorded, it is true, in the footnotes to the text), which, with the pointing and interrogation-marks of Hermann, yields a much more vivacious and idiomatic text than that adopted here. Moreover, *ἄλλα ἀποκρινεῖσθαι* fits the defiant *οἴκ αὐδοκεῖ* above much better if taken in the sense 'contradict us' than in the sense 'change their reply.' In 521 C Hermann's *οὐσία ἐπάνοδος* (after Iamblichus) is the only readable idiomatic text here. Only desperate ingenuity can construe the others. In 606 C the text or footnotes should indicate Hermann's *δῆ* (for *δὲ*), which the commentary rightly prefers.

The most notable feature of the commentary is the excellence of its literary form. The translations given are felicitous and the expression is always just and vigorous, whether in the paraphrase of an idiom, the elucidation of the exact force of a particle or the discrimination of Platonic synonyms. Very interesting, too, are the little sermonizing, reflective paragraphs, in the style of the essays that accompany Jowett's Plato, scattered here and there throughout the notes. They are the kind of remark that a judicious teacher would wish to be able to address to his class in occasional digressions, by way of relief to the stricter interpretation of the text. One may call attention especially to the observations on casuistry, p. 12, on Plato as a political economist, p. 85, on psychology, p. 202, on ridicule as the test of truth, p. 217, on international law, p. 244, on metaphysics, p. 268, on the philosopher in the world, p. 287. These little essays are full of quoted or quotable things, as for example, p. 30: "Mankind are rightly jealous of their principles being reduced to the level of their practice"; p. 174: "The habit of mind which has been acquired in making necessary distinctions may go on to make unnecessary ones"; p. 245: "A great nation's little wars are commonly the least creditable part of her history"; p. 281: "There are two classes not marked in the vocabulary of party and found in all parties—the inferior minds and the superior."

These qualities lend the commentary an educational usefulness in excess of its strictly scientific value. In a complete commentary on the Republic we should look, after the text had been settled and the few antiquarian or historical allusions explained, first for notes on the particles, on Platonic synonyms and idioms, and for illustration of the thought and language from other Platonic dialogues—and all this we find admirably done here. But we should also demand illuminating philosophic interpretation of the thought in relation to Plato's system as a whole and to similar modern speculations, and erudite illustration of the influence of the Republic on later Greek literature, and here we should be disappointed. The conscientiously explicit notes on the particles in the earlier books studied in connection with the corresponding sections of Professor Campbell's essay would almost enable the student to dispense with a teacher. The delicate implications of the various uses of *ἄλλα*, the use of *δή* or *καὶ δή καὶ* in the special application of a rule, the resumptive *οὐ* or *μέντος* of meditative transition or challenged assent to an admitted fact affecting the argument, the *ἀπα* of disclaimed responsibility, and

other familiar friends are described with a precision somewhat surprising to the reader of Jowett's translations.

It is perhaps hypercritical to miss notes on the difference between *οὐ δῆτα* and *οὐ δήπον*, on the *αὐ* of impatience or exasperation, 393 D, on the *οὐν* of reluctant concession, 440 A, on *ἄρα* = 'if it so be that,' 361 A, on the ironical *δῆ*, 561 B, 562 E, on the frequent intensifying use of *οὐδέ ne—quidem* 'neither,' on the *καὶ* of 387 D, on the slight touch of the oratorical style in the *καίτοι* of 360 C, on the *δῆ* that calls attention to an etymology in 365 A.

The shading of Platonic synonyms and the eulogistic or dyslogistic suggestions with which his words are charged are carefully noted; e. g. *ἱμνεῖν* 329 B, *δρός* 331 D, *οιομένον* 336 A, *ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι* 336 B, *δεινός* 337 A, *ἀναπέφανται* 350 B, *εὐχερός* 364 A, *φορτικός* 367 A, *σκυτούμον* 369 D, *χορτάζειν* 372 D, *καμψός* 376 A, *συχνός* 376 D, *δοκοῦντες* 420 A, *καλινδεῖσθαι* 479 D, *κάθηνται* 559 D, *δύκον* 373 B, *λεγομένων* 431 C.

The notes also serve as admirable stage-directions to the comic by-play of the dialogue. Cf. especially 338 C, 341 A B, 348 C, 351 C. And the mechanism for the dialogue and the countless minor felicities of Plato's style are analyzed with fine literary sense and not infrequently illustrated by pertinent parallels, especially from Shakspere.

Positive errors of interpretation are few and slight. The notes occasionally call attention to trifling mistakes in the last edition of Jowett's translation. A number of corrections to that translation made in this Journal (XIII 364 foll.) seem to have been silently accepted; e. g. in 464 E *ἀνάγκην σωμάτων ἐπιμελεῖα τιθέντες*, formerly rendered "we shall make the protection of the person a matter of necessity," and in A. J. P., loc. cit., "compelling them (by the indirect effect of our legislation) to develop their muscle" is now interpreted "in this way we shall oblige them to keep themselves in condition." In 473 A no explicit notice is taken of the correction in A. J. P. of the very confused translation, but our phrase ad loc.: "Plato is inverting the familiar Greek antithesis of word and deed and challenging the Democritean *Δόγος ἔργον σκῆνη*," appears in the note: "*κὰν εἰ μή τῷ δοκεῖ*] i. e. though it may seem an inversion of the recognized opposition between *λόγος* and *ἔργον*." So at 498 A the criticism in A. J. P.: "The point is not that they are frightened away, but that they wrongly begin with the hardest part of the subject," is virtually accepted in the note: "That is to say the study of Philosophy as at present pursued begins too early at the wrong end and ends too soon." In 525 B the structure of the sentence is now correctly given, in accordance with the criticism in A. J. P. The rendering of *ἢ μηδέποτε λογιστικῷ γενέσθαι* "and therefore he must be an arithmetician" has been changed to "because without emerging, etc., he can never become an arithmetician." The true force of *λογιστικῷ* ('an adept in the calculations of the higher reason') is still ignored. Plato is playing with the double meaning of *λογιστικός*. It is a most lame and impotent conclusion to affirm that the philosopher must study arithmetic or he can never become an arithmetician. In 597 C our suggestion that *τοῖς τοιούτοις κακοῖς* is the dative of the measure of excess is given as an alternative construction. It is the only one allowed by the context. In 581 C our correction of *λέγωμεν τὰ πρῶτα* "we may begin by assuming" to "the three primary classes," etc., is adopted. In 607 A our interpretation of *τοῦ ἀεὶ δόξαντος*, etc.,

as prospective, i. e. "the rule that the common reason shall from time to time have pronounced to be the best" is given as an alternative version in the form "that reason which from time to time appears best to the majority." It is the only possible rendering. In 611 B our reference of ὡς τὸν ἡμίν ἐφάνη η ψυχή to the apparent complexity of the soul rather than to its demonstrated immortality is preferred by L. C. as an alternative interpretation. The notes on δημοτικῆς ἀρετῆς 500 D, on πολιτικὴν γέ 430 C, and on ὡς πλήθει 389 D embody the substance of our remarks in A. J. P. XIII 3, p. 362.

Of what seem to me reaffirmations of errors the following may be noted. In 341 C οὐδὲν ὀν καὶ ταῦτα is rendered by L. C. (apparently) "though here again you are nobody, i. e. with as little effect as ever," καὶ ταῦτα being thus taken in antithesis to former occasions when Thrasymachus attempted the same game. A note signed B. J. substantially repeats the rendering of the translation "and you failed" in the form "although you make a fool of yourself at that too," i. e. at cheating Thrasymachus as you would also have done at shaving a lion. But the obvious meaning to my mind is: "and you did attempt it, and that too though you are a thing of naught." Compare the absolute use of οὐδὲν γάρ ἔστι in Anterast. 134 C, and the idiomatic καὶ ταῦτα οὐσαν "and that too though it exists" of Kleitophon 408 E. In 344 E the editors persist in rendering γὰρ "or rather" instead of "or else." It is a trifling matter, but the evidence is against them. The word occurs again in 400 C ἡροὶ ξνναμφέτερόν τι, and is there rendered by the editors themselves "or perhaps the combined effect of both," and in 433 Α τοῦτο ἔστιν ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ γὰρ τούτον τι εἰδος η δικαιοσύνη, where they render "this or rather some form of this is justice." But Jowett's translation reads "now justice is this principle or a part of it," and that is the most natural version, in view of the tentative, undogmatic tone of the paragraph. In the passage in question (344 E) our editors err in dropping the interrogation-point after ἔχειν. Thrasymachus says sullenly: "Do I think otherwise?" (of the importance of the issue). To which Socrates replies: "you appear to, or else to care nothing for us." There is nothing in the context to justify "or rather."

I am loth to renew the discussion of the image of the mutinous ship's crew in 488 E. As I have said already, "the text here will always be doubtful, . . . but it is certain that it is the true pilot, not the mob, who doubts the possibility of combining the pilot's art with the politician's knack of seizing the helm, whether other people like it or not." Our editors' rendering makes the thought run: (1) They (the mob of sailors) call the man who is clever at seizing the helm the true pilot. (2) They do not know that the true pilot must study navigation, (3) but to get the helm into one's hands in defiance of opposition is an art and study which they imagine to be irreconcilable with the acquisition of the science of navigation. The real Platonic sequence of thought is: (1) They call the grasper of the helm the true pilot; (2) They do not know that the true pilot must devote himself to the study of navigation, and (3) that he does not believe that *there is any art of seizing the helm*, or practice of it, whose acquisition is compatible with mastery of the true pilot's art. In the italicized words I have imperfectly indicated a subtlety of the original generally missed. Plato chooses a form of expression which, while explicitly denying the compatibility of the helm-seizing (the politician's) with

the pilot's (the statesman's) art, hints that the former is no art at all. This is effected by the isolated position of *μήτε τέχνην τούτον*, 488 E; cf. 493 B and especially 518 D with Gorgias 462 B.

In 534 A *τὴν δὲ οἰς ταῦτα ἀναλογίαν καὶ διαιρεσιν διχῇ ἐκατέρου, δοξαστοῦ τε καὶ νοητοῦ, ἔωμεν*, the precise point is, I think, still missed by the version "the exact proportion to each other of the things to which these terms apply, and the division of the spheres of opinion and reason severally." The *δοξαστόν* and *νοητόν* are the objective realities corresponding to *δόξα* and *νοήσις*. Plato proposes to pass over the quadripartite division of them, corresponding to the division already indicated of the subjective faculties. *ἐφ' οἷς ταῦτα* then means not "the things to which these terms apply," but the objective correlates of these subjective faculties (cf. 477 D, 480 A). One reason for passing them over, as I have shown more fully elsewhere, is that there is no objective correlate for *διάνοια*. In 574 C *Σμικρά γ' ἔφη κακὰ λέγεις οὖν ὅλησις ψων οἱ τουοῦτοι*, the rendering of the translation, "a small catalogue of evils even if the perpetrators of them are few in number," is ingeniously defended by the assumption that *σμικρά* is intended ironically, but that it is taken up seriously in Socrates' reply: *τὰ γὰρ σμικρὰ κτλ.* But the 'even' is not in the text, and it is a waste of ingenuity to read it in.

In other difficult or doubtful passages the editors often resort to the device of alternative renderings, so much employed in Professor Campbell's Sophocles, and not infrequently argue against each other in little polemical paragraphs signed L. C. or B. J. Thus in 331 C for *ἀπλῶς οὐτως* we have our choice of "thus absolutely" and "just absolutely." The former is preferable. In 333 E they read *λαθεῖν ἐμποιῆσαι*, rejecting Schneider's *ἐμποιήσας*, and the piety of Professor Campbell has preserved a note of Professor Jowett objecting to the impression "that *λαθεῖν νόσον* 'to dodge a disease' is not good Greek." This, like the utterance at 412 D, "that it is not probable that *ὅταν* is ever followed by the optative mood," has a purely biographical interest. In 334 D *δοσοὶ διημαρτήκασι: τὸν ἀνθρώπων* the rendering of the translation, "many a man who is ignorant of human nature" suits the context and Platonic usage better than that of the notes: "that is to say those of mankind who are in error."

In 339 E *ἄρα τότε ὁ σοφώτατε*, etc., L. C. joins *ἄρα* with *δικαῖον*, after Ast and Madvig. B. J. puts a comma after *οὐτωσι*, making *ἄρα* indefinite. The former would be more idiomatic and Platonic if Socrates were making the point for the first time. But he is repeating it for Thrasymachus' unwilling comprehension, and *οὐτωσι* pauses to recall the previous statement at the beginning of 339 D; cf. 360 A *καὶ αὐτῷ οὐτῷ ξυμβαίνειν* of a verification. In 348 E *τοῦτο ἥδη στρεψάτερον* the second version, "this is harder to make an impression upon," is better than the first, "this new position is firmer," etc. *στρεψές* connotes stubbornness, and Thrasymachus' position is not really firmer in the opinion of Socrates, but only harder to deal with dialectically. In 371 A the alternative version of *ῶν ἢν δέωνται* 'whatever the things may be that they require' is obviously wrong and should be suppressed. In 377 B and 378 A *ῥᾳδίως οὐτω* means (1) "thus lightly," not (2) "lightly as is now commonly done, though the second meaning may be injured."

In 387 E the words *ἴσως εὐ ἔχει πρὸς ἄλλο τι* refer to the aesthetic effects of the poetry, whose moral teachings are deprecated, as proved by 390 A. It is

overrefining to see an allusion to the moralizing influence of the fear of the last judgment, as is suggested also in the essays, vol. II, p. 20. In 395 B the emphatic "or else" meaning of *ἢ* would assume a linguistically impossible ellipsis. 395 D ἀνδρί, obviously her husband, not a man.

397 B πρὸς τὴν αὐτὴν λέγειν. L. C. argues at length for the interpretation πρὸς τὴν αὐτὴν, sc. χορδήν, but is unable to cite a parallel. It is by no means certain that Plato was himself distinctly conscious of the ellipsis in such a phrase. The editors diverge widely on the syntax of the loose sentence 407 D. L. C. seems right in taking τὰ—σώματα in pendent construction similar to τοὺς μὲν above. But B. J. is right in making μὴ οἰεσθαι δεῖν depend on φῶμεν. καταδεῖξαι ιατρικὴν . . . μὴ οἰεσθαι δεῖν would be too harsh. The editors do not remark on the necessity of reserving the *τε* in φαρμάκους τε καὶ τομαῖς for προστάττειν.

In 411 C εἰωχῆται εὖ μάλα is not to be taken "fare sumptuously," but rather with L. C. "if he take his fill of it."

In 415 B refer αὐτοῖς to ἐκύόνοντι and τούτων to the various metals, with B. J.

422 B. The meaning "perhaps" for πολλάκις is out of place here, and is rendered extremely improbable by the distance of πολλάκις from *εἰ* and the absence of a warning *ἄρα*.

425 B. L. C.'s suggestion that κατακλίσεις should be taken actively is to be approved. In 437 C it will be hard to find a parallel for ἐπινείειν . . . πρὸς αὐτὴν in the alternative sense suggested: "beckon them with a nod towards herself." It obviously refers to the soul's internal dialogue.

458 A. It is more idiomatic to construe *καὶ* with *ὑστερον*, with L. C.

472 C. B. J. is right in arguing against L. C. that *εἰ γένοιτο* is not seriously inconsistent with τούτον ἔνεκα, infra. The *εἰ γένοιτο* is the necessary accompaniment of *οἷος ἀν εἰη γενόμενος*, and does not prejudge the question of the probability of actual realization.

478 C μὴ δν γε. L. C. is right in pressing *γε* and rendering "not-being since non-existent."

494 D τῶν λόγων is general—"reason," "dialectic." In 484 A the suggestion is hazarded that αὐτοῖς is to be supplied and that διεξελθόντος is to be taken transitively, "which has discussed them."

503 C. The second interpretation is the only admissible one. *νεανικοί* and *μεγαλοπρεπεῖς*, in spite of their position, belong with *μνήμονες* and *ὅξεις* as constituents of the impetuous, ardent temperament opposed to the *κόσμοι*. Plato's uniform usage leaves no doubt on this point.

506 A. B. J. is right in interpreting πρότερον "before he sees how they are good." Plato is not arguing that the ideal statesman must know the good before others, but that he must know the good before he can understand the essential nature of justice and the virtues.

507 E. L. C. is right in supplying παραγενομένον with τινός.

554 C. B. J.'s alternative, "by some virtuous restraint which he puts upon himself," is obviously mistaken.

558 A. (2) "the meekness of some of the condemned" is preferable.

560 B. (2) is right.

563 C γίγνονται; there is no need of supplying ἐλεύθεροι, or of supposing a word dropped (L. C.), or of construing γίγνονται with εἰθισμένοι. The predicate

with γίγνονται is οἰαίπερ, the τε δή is loose conversational repetition of τε above, and εἰδισμένοι, etc., is loose expexegetic apposition to οἰαίπερ, though of course literally inapplicable to δέσπουναι. This sounds complicated, but is simple enough if we follow Plato's toying with the proverb in the order of the Greek.

A few miscellaneous observations may be added here.

440 D νικᾶ καὶ οὐ λάρη τὸν γενναῖων is rendered "does not desist from noble efforts," and so Stallbaum: "generoso opere." τὸν γενναῖων means "in the case of the truly noble" and is to be taken with θυμός "understood." It is one of the characteristic parenthetic Platonic suggestions of the class to which the statement is applicable, and corresponds in this function to ὅσῳ ἀν γενναῖοτερος ἡ above. νικᾶ is awkward, and no good remedy has been suggested. φιλονεικεῖ is obvious, but not very probable.

465 C κολακείας τε πλονοίων πένητες, etc. Why not take πένητες as subject of ισχοντο, displaced to mark antithesis with πλονοίων?

469 A. It is surely misleading to say that τιθέναι is used absolutely for ἐγ ταφὰς τιθέναι, though that is the meaning.

529 A οἱ εἰς φιλοσοφίαν ἀνάγοντες. Is not this simply "those who introduce their pupils to philosophic studies"? It seems to be so taken in L. and S. s. v. ἀνάγεν. For the tone of the passage cf. Protag. 319 D E.

In 573 D ἑορτὰ γίγνονται παρ' αἴτοις κτλ. our editors say that ὁν is governed by ἔρως, "whatever things are the objects of the tyrant passion that lives within." Take ὁν rather with τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς as resumptive of αἴτοις above, and render: "feasts and carousals and revellings arise among them—among those, that is, all the concerns of whose souls are swayed by the tyrant ἔρως within." ὁν ἀν makes a class or limitation fittingly with αἴτοις. It cannot properly do so with τοιάντα πάντα, which is sufficiently explained by what precedes and needs no further definition. The thought is "revels, etc., arise among men of this sort whose souls are swayed by a ruling desire," not "revels arise and such things whatsoever they be the love of which," etc. The passage is unconsciously rendered rightly by Jowett in the translation: "Love is the lord of the house within him, and orders all the concerns of his soul."

The problem of the 'number' is valiantly attacked by Professor Campbell, but no convincing solution is reached, and until this is done it seems idle to print more on the subject. The same may be said of Mr. Craigie's contributed note on the "order of Plato's enumeration of the planets in Rep. X 616 E ff." Nor is there anything especially new or significant in the brief discussions of Plato's banishment of the poets, unless it be the somewhat captious observation that in 472 B and in 501 ff. Plato talks of painters as copyists of the Idea, while in book X he speaks of them along with poets as mere copyists of the copy.

Of the quality of the commentary on the philosophic side, it is not needful to add much to the remarks already made on Professor Campbell's essays. Elaborate philosophic interpretation of the Platonic ontology was, as the surviving editor explicitly says, beyond the scope of the work. The drift of particular passages and the evolution of the argument from page to page are clearly indicated. But there is a deplorable tendency here and there (e. g. 379 B, 435 A, 477 A) to read Plato lessons in elementary logic which no man

ever needed less, and to measure and interpret him by inapplicable modern canons or fanciful analogies. For example, it is a bit of pedantry unworthy of our editors to label Plato's literary procedure in 427 D sqq. "the method of residues," and then solemnly demonstrate that it does not strictly conform to Mill's canons. And one hardly knows how to characterize the fantastic suggestion (505 D) that the argument that men may acquiesce in sham virtue but desire the reality of 'good' "is in some degree like that of Anselm and Descartes, that the highest perfection involves existence."

Again, the unity of the central argument is nowhere sufficiently emphasized, nor is there any clear appreciation of the art with which the thin strands of ethical, sociological and psychological argument are twisted into one. The few ontological passages are too strongly contrasted with the doctrine of the professedly ontological or metaphysical dialogues, and the significance of the Idea of Good in relation to the structure of the Republic, to Plato's thought as a whole and to modern ethics is missed.

These matters could be set forth adequately only in a continuous positive exposition such as I have attempted elsewhere. Here I will merely note a few isolated points by way of illustration of my meaning.

In 505 A, instead of references to 438 A, we should have been referred to Charmides 174 B C, Laches 199 D, Euthyd. 291-2, and in lieu of the remark "are all these meanings of 'good' the same?"—would have been the question of Aristotle; it would have been more profitable to show that the keenest ethical writers of recent times, Sidgwick and Leslie Stephen, concur with Plato in the demand that all social and ethical conceptions be referred ultimately to some final ideal of 'good.' Much the same may be said of the vague note on 508 E: "The intense reality of all beauty and all truth, when seen according to the divine idea, is perhaps as near as we can come to the meaning of Plato."

509 A *τὴν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἔξιν*. Even if we grant that the phrase = *τὸ ἀγαθὸν ὡς ἐχει* in its first intention, it certainly carries with it the purely ethical connotation of the "habit of goodness."

516 A. The supposition that the moon and stars may symbolize the ideas of Being, Truth, Sameness, Difference, etc., is purely fantastic.

524 C *διὰ δὲ τὴν τούτον σαφῆνεται*. The construction indicated by the version, "But with a view to clearing up this chaos of sense," is right. The philosophic note illustrating Plato's meaning by the theory of vision is a misconception of Plato's simplicity. The confusion of which Plato speaks is the apparent contradiction between sense-perception accepted as a complete unanalyzed whole, and the abstractions denoted by language. The problem of the modern theory of vision is to analyze out and discriminate the purely sensuous and the intellectual elements in sense-perception. We cannot properly speak of Plato's 'error' in relation to a problem which he did not contemplate at all and which was irrelevant to his main purpose.

530 B *προβλήμασιν ἄρα*, etc. The reference to Phaedo 97 D E is out of place. There Socrates yearns for an explanation of the order of the universe through benevolent design. Here he affirms that we must study the relations of quantity and force in abstractions, and not attempt to extract them by induction from their imperfect, concrete embodiments.

533 B. The statement that mathematics have a scientific basis only when referred to the Idea of Good is a half truth which is practically a falsehood. Plato's thought, as I have elsewhere shown, is: (1) All social and moral institutions can be understood only in their relation to an ultimate ideal of good. (2) They can be related to that ideal only by a mind disciplined in abstractions and the severest dialectic. (3) Mathematics affords the best preliminary discipline in abstractions, but is not the highest dialectic, because the mathematician cannot, like the dialectician, go behind his premises when required to do so, till ultimate acceptable postulates are reached. This conception of dialectic in no wise contradicts that of Philebus 58 A, that it deals with *ōv* *qua* *ōv* in Aristotle's language. (4) As applied to the material world, the Idea of Good is an ultimate *āpx̄* only as faith sees it embodied in the beneficent designs of God. Its operation cannot be traced in detail, and it is not in this sense an essential part of the thought of the Republic.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

PAUL SHOREY.

Geschichte des Plusquamperfekts im Lateinischen von Dr. H. BLASE. Giessen, 1894. Pp. 112.

The author, one of the collaborators upon the new historical grammar, is well and favorably known through his dissertation on conditional sentences and his admirable *Geschichte des Irrealis*. The present pamphlet deals with the pluperfect in both indicative and subjunctive. As to the indicative, the whole question, in Blase's opinion, has been confused rather than clarified by the introduction of the 'absolute' and 'relative' notions. The true question is, 'What is the relation of the pluperfect to its temporal environment?' Foth, in Böhmer's *Romanische Studien*, 1876, has shown from the Romance languages that the Latin pluperfect underwent a shifting of meaning. The indicative became a preterite in French, a conditional in Spanish, Portuguese and Provençal; the subjunctive became an imperfect. Foth's results are in the main correct, but his division of Latin verbs into two classes, in one of which the perfect, because of the meaning of the verb, acquires the force of a present, Blase thinks erroneous. He therefore examines the facts of usage in Plautus, with these results: (1) The plupf. in early Latin is often used in its proper sense when the past act to which it is related is not mentioned in the immediate context. (2) In about ten cases the perf. and the plupf. are coordinated; this may be explained by metrical convenience. (3) The plupf. is also used rhetorically in anticipation of an immediately following past tense. (4) There are no 'absolute' uses of the plupf. (5) Shifting occurs only with *fueram*, *a*) alone, *b*) with *aequom*, *par*, etc., *c*) with perf. pass. ptc. In all these cases it is equivalent to *eram* or *fui*. This shift of tense-force is due to the combination of *fui* and *eram* (*Combinationausgleichung*), while e. g. *dixi* and *dicebam* could not unite into *dixeram*. This explains the occurrence with *fueram* only.

In the classical Latin the usage widens to include a few cases of *habueram* and verbs meaning *can* and *ought*, perhaps under the influence of *aequom fuerat*. The rhetorical use (3 above) is common in Vergil and the historians.

The tendency to shift continues down to the fourth century and then shows a great extension among the African writers, no doubt because of the incompleteness of the Semitic tense-system. The use of *fueram* for *eram* with perf. ptc., which the more accurate writers like Cicero and Caesar avoid, became very frequent and in some late writers predominant. See table on pp. 60-1.

As to the plupf. subjunctive, it is assumed that its original temporal meaning was the same as that of the plupf. indicative, but the cause of the shifting of tense-force was a different one, which Blase had already discussed in his *Geschichte des Irrealis*. The Latin had at first no form for unreal conditions, but used sometimes the present subjunctive for present conditions and the imperfect indicative for the past. When the impf. and plupf. subjunctive assumed this function, beginning about the time of Plautus, they necessarily assumed also the tense-force of such conditions, the impf. becoming a present and the plupf. a preterite. This use, however, was almost confined during the classical period to conditional and optative sentences, and extended itself more slowly, though in the end more evenly, than the corresponding shift in the indicative. The indicative became partly a preterite, partly a conditional, showing by the variation that the process was not complete in Latin, but the subjunctive became a preterite in all branches of the derived languages.

This is a valuable presentation of facts which have either not been observed or not collected before, and it is also a good piece of scientific work, in which causes and effects are well brought out. There are certainly great advantages in a method which traces a single phenomenon through many authors over the method which follows out all the usages of a single author, and Blase has used the opportunity well. The pamphlet must be read by all students of the history of modes and tenses.

I must, however, say that I have not been convinced by Blase's explanation of the origin of the shifting. In the first place, what Ziemer calls 'Combinationausgleichung' results in the combination of two constructions, but I do not know any case where it results in the use of a third and different word. *impertio alicui salutem* and *dono aliquem salute* may give *impertio aliquem salute*, but it does not follow, without more proof, that *fui* and *eram* could draw *fueram* away from its ordinary sense to a tense-force somewhere between *eram* and *fui* or could create a new word *fueram*. Second, in order to explain the origin in this way, Blase has to show that the shifting in early Latin is found only with *fueram*, not, e. g., with *dixeram*. The reasoning by which he seeks to do this (pp. 18-20) seems to me insufficient and even wrong in method. For example, of Merc. 975 *ille quidem illam sese ancillam emisse dixerat*, he says, "Das war schon v. 390 geschehen"; of Capt. 194 . . . *quo ire dixeram . . .*, "Das hat er v. 126 gesagt, also = bevor alles das geredet wurde, was zwischen v. 126 u. 194 steht." But the same reasoning might be used of *dixi* Capt. prol. 59; it was in v. 24 that he had spoken of the war, and meanwhile he had been speaking of the argument of the play. So *dixi* Capt. 558 refers back to 547, before Aristophontes had interrupted the talk. And, generally, it is plain that half the perfects would refer back to something said before some other event had occurred. Some sharper test than Blase uses is needed to disprove the whole of Lübbert's doctrine. And even in the modified form in which Blase uses it, the explanation of the coordination of *dixi* and *dixeram* by metrical convenience is not

satisfying. In the third place, Foth's suggestion that the meaning of the verb influences its tense-force is too good to be dropped. It rests upon and explains too many facts, e. g. the use of *habui* and *fui* 'I had (was), but have (am) not now,' the use of the same perf. form for inchoatives and for simple verbs, the Plautine *adstiti* = *adsto*, and others. It would explain also the very important fact, which Blasé's theory does not explain, that, however the shifting may have begun, it spreads along the line of verb-meaning, from *aequom fuerat* to *debuerat* and *oportuerat*.

To point out flaws in so good a piece of work as this is an ungrateful task, but what I have said touches at most only a small part of the book.

E. P. MORRIS.

Was ist Syntax? Ein kritischer Versuch von JOHN RIES. Marburg, 1894.
Pp. 163.

The author is a Germanic philologist and his illustrations are drawn largely from this field, but his arguments and conclusions have a general application and deserve the notice of classical philologists. The outline of the argument is this:—

The meaning of syntax and its relation to other parts of grammar call for new definition. Three systems have hitherto been followed. First, the mixed system, in which the arrangement is partly logical, partly formal; second, the system of Miklosich, which avoids the confusion of the mixed system by confining syntax to the doctrine of the meaning of words and classes of words, omitting all study of the clause; third, the system which makes syntax the science of the sentence. The mixed system is condemned by its nature, and the system of Miklosich by its exclusion of the most important part of syntax. The third doctrine, that *Syntax ist Satzlehre*, is now somewhat widely held, but is also open to serious objections. The sentence is a logical rather than a linguistic unit, the definitions of a sentence vary greatly, and phrases and clauses can be treated only as parts of a sentence. Difficulties therefore arise in the application of the doctrine. Schmalz, in Müller's Handbuch, vol. II, under the heading Simple Sentences, treats cases, modes, tenses, i. e. falls into mixed syntax, and, still worse, he treats these under declarative sentences, as if they did not belong equally to interrogative sentences.

The way out of all this confusion is to substitute the series *sound—word—combination of words* for the series *sound—word—sentence*, as descriptive of the three kinds of objects treated in grammar, and to recognize the fundamental distinction between *form* and *meaning*. This gives (omitting sounds, which have no corresponding meaning and can be treated only from the formal point of view) a cross-division, according as we classify by the object treated or by the method, thus:

	<i>Words.</i>	<i>Word-combinations.</i>
<i>Form.</i>	Inflection.	Syntactical Forms.
<i>Meaning.</i>	Semasiology.	Syntactical Functions.

The chief difficulty of the system lies in the fact that it is impossible to draw a perfectly clear line between the meaning of inflectional forms and their use in sentences. In fact, inflection does not exist in isolation, but only when the word enters into combination with other words. The difficulty, however, is one of logic rather than of practice, for in all grammars the distinction is actually made, though not always clearly, the form and a simple definition of the genitive, for example, being given under the head of inflections, while the uses are reserved for syntax. Grimm and Diez divide the treatment of gender in the same way. If some slight repetition or overlapping results, it is not harmful, but is like the repetitions which necessarily occur in any science which treats the same material from different standpoints.

Ries's system is not a mere war about words. It will not, indeed, solve all the problems of order and arrangement which trouble the writer of a Latin grammar, but it will enable an investigator in any field of grammar except phonetics to approach his task with a clearer conception of its limitations and of its relation to other problems, and that is a great gain. American scholars especially should note two points. First, in any fair division of the field of grammar the new science of Semasiology claims a larger share of attention than it is now receiving, and, being to a considerable extent virgin soil, it holds out the hope of large rewards to those who first enter upon it. Second, Ries lays great, but not too great, stress upon the need of distinguishing between form and function in syntactical work. He says that every competent investigator begins with the form and works toward the function. I should prefer to say that, while functional classification may at times be a useful temporary expedient, the investigator who cannot ultimately define the forms which correspond to his functional classifications is a blind guide. Browning might 'neglect the form,' but the student of syntax who does it is lost.

E. P. MORRIS.

Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Religionen, von Dr. PAUL DEUSSEN. Erster Band, erste Abtheilung: Allgemeine Einleitung und Philosophie des Veda bis auf die Upanishad's.

Dr. Paul Deussen has already won a name as an interpreter of Hindu philosophy, his *System des Vedānta* and *Sūtra* (of the same school) having showed him to be a patient and careful student. The present work, of which the first part of the first volume is at hand, takes a much wider sweep, as is sufficiently indicated by the title. Deussen purposes to give the history of the philosophy of the Hindus in the first volume of this work (with an excursus in five chapters on the philosophy of the Chinese); that of the Greeks in the first part of the second volume (with a chapter on Roman philosophy); that of the Egyptians, Semites, Iranians, Christians, and scholastics of the middle ages in the second part of the same volume (with an excursus on Byzantine, Arabian and Judaic culture); and a complete account of modern philosophy in the third part of the same second volume. A mighty undertaking, the daring of which must awaken universal admiration, the more so if, as is done in the first part, not only philosophy but religion, and not only religion but mythology

are to be woven into the plan. In this first part of the first volume Deussen discusses at length "das erste kindliche Lallen des philosophierenden Menschengeistes" (Preface, p. xiii), as it appears in the Rig-Veda, the Atharvan, and the Brähmanas. The subtitle saves the author from the ready reproach that he has dedicated to religion more than three hundred pages, of which but few have anything to do with philosophy. But even thus we can see no especial point in translating in full some of the passages which are here cited from the Rig-Veda—for instance, the Frog Hymn. This poem is important for the history of Hindu religion, but it has nothing to do with philosophy. Nor does a popular handbook of universal philosophy seem to be the proper place to discuss at length the interpretation of the most unintelligible Vedic hymns; still less to devote several pages to *Belege* for the development of the meaning of Ātman. There seems to be a lack of proportion in this and other particulars, which it is to be hoped will not be so pronounced in the succeeding volumes. For the Sanskrit scholar there is not much that is new in the present division, and for the non-Sanskrit scholar there is too much Sanskrit. Otherwise there is little to object to, and the half-volume presents a very useful collection of everything bearing on and leading up to the later philosophy; for we take issue with Deussen in regard to his liberal interpretation of 'philosophy' (as well as in regard to the Rig-Veda's *Lallen*), and for our own part should accept as philosophy not one-tenth of what the author puts under that caption. The best of the book is the weight laid upon the entirely Brahmanic character of the Atharva-Veda (in which Prajāpati is already an antiquated figure) as compared with the Rik, where he is not yet quite developed (p. 189; Deussen calls the remnant-cult of the Atharvan, p. 238, pseudophilosophy; we should call it simply an unintellectual side of religion); and the careful discrimination in the phases of development of the pantheistic idea as registered in Prajāpati, Brahman (*brahma*) and Ātman, Deus and 'Ding an sich' with priestly prayer-mysticism intervening (p. 239). It is somewhat surprising that in the only passage which has to do with real philosophy, the Çāndilyan teaching, Deussen simply says that this doctrine registers the beginning of Upanishadic pantheism, and does not mention that in the failure to identify the individual soul with the unconditioned *brahma* lies the root of the famous 'Çāndilyan heresy.' But the Çāndilyan chapter (of Brähmaṇa and Upanishad both) is perhaps to be taken up again in the second part of the volume.

E. W. H.

REPORTS.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM FÜR PHILOLOGIE, Vol. XLIX.

Pp. 1-20. Die Münzreform Solons. H. Nissen explains the tenth chapter of Aristotle's *'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία*, and defends it against the criticism of C. F. Lehmann (*Hermes*, XXVII 530-60; A. J. P. XV 392), Bruno Keil and Wilamowitz-Moellendorff.

Pp. 21-36. Zur Schriftstellerei des Mythographen Hyginus. J. Dietze discusses the relation of the *Fabulae* to the *Genealogiae*. The *Fabulae* cannot be the great work on the legends of the gods and heroes which is promised in the *Astronomia*, but must have been written before the *Astronomia*. The *Genealogiae* and the *Fabulae* were probably not separate works. The first part of the *Genealogiae* contained the stemmata of the gods and heroes, the second part treated the stories about them and was the source of our collection of *fabulae*. This work being used as a textbook in schools, the dry and tiresome first part was soon much abridged, and the title *Genealogiae*, no longer suiting the contents, was lost.

Pp. 37-58. Feuerzauber. E. Kuhnert treats of the magic rites in which fire was employed in casting a spell over some one. Illustrations are cited from Vergil, Horace, Theocritus, the papyri and the inscriptions.

Pp. 59-71. Die kleinen Schriften des Alexander von Aphrodisias. Textual notes by O. Apelt.

Pp. 72-90. Zur Quellenkunde von Platons Leben. A. Busse. The common source of the various accounts of Plato's life is found in the *Atthis* of Philochorus.

Pp. 91-110. Zu den Melanippen des Euripides. R. Wünsch attempts to reconstruct the plots of the *Μελανίππη σοφῆ* and *Μελανίππη δεσμῶτις*. The latter play must have been written before B. C. 412. It is possible that Euripides wrote a *Μελάνιππος* as well.

Pp. 111-132. Die Phoeniker am aegaeischen Meer. J. Beloch. Ever since the days of Herodotus it has been commonly believed that in the most remote antiquity the vessels of Phoenician traders were already coasting around the Aegean. This view is based upon a group of transparent myths and legends. Herodotus got it from Homer, who was to him a single author who had composed both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. The Homeric poems attest the presence of Phoenician traders in the Aegean only for the time at which the later books were written—about the end of the eighth and the first half of the seventh century. Homer's nautical terminology shows no trace of Phoenician influence, and Greek seamanship appears to have been an independent development; it is probable that the Ionians were already settled on the west coast

of Asia Minor when the Phoenicians first visited that region. The art of Mycenae was probably not of Phoenician origin; most of the remains of Phoenician art which have been discovered in Greece belong to the eighth and seventh centuries; the works of art described in the later books of Homer show Phoenician influence, those of the earlier books do not; in Greek vase-painting Oriental influence first appears in the seventh century. The Greeks and Phoenicians seem to have made their way into the western Mediterranean at about the same time—not earlier than the eighth century—the former planting colonies in Sicily, Italy and Gaul, the latter in Libya, Sardinia and Spain. It is unlikely that there were ever any Phoenician colonies on the shores of the Aegean; no certain traces of such settlements have been found; few places, if any, bore Semitic names; there are very few borrowed Semitic words in Greek, in Homer perhaps none; the religion of the Phoenicians had no more influence on the Greeks than their language; and, finally, the Homeric poems make no mention of such colonies.

Pp. 133–61. *Zur antiken Stillehre aus Anlass von Proklos' Chrestomathie.* W. Schmid. Proclus is a Stoic grammarian who must have lived a little before Hermogenes of Tarsus.

Miscellen.—P. 162. Th. Kock. *Noch einmal Euripides Fragm. 953 N^o.* Kom. Apollodoros Fragm. 13 K.—Pp. 163–7. L. Radermacher. *Grammatisches zu Diodor.* On the use of the future participle to express purpose.—Pp. 167–8. R. Förster. *Zur Görlicher Lucianhandschrift.* Zu Julian.—Pp. 168–70. E. Bruhn. *De εἰς vocabulo adnotatio grammatica.* On the use of *εἰς* for *τις*.—Pp. 170–2. M. Manitius. Zu den Gedichten Priscians. The Periegesis is the work of a Christian writer.—Pp. 172–4. M. Manitius. Zu Orientius. Textual notes.—Pp. 174–5. O. Hense. Zu Seneca de tranquillitate animi. Note on De Tranqu. 4, 3 with a parallel from De Clem. II 26, 2.—Pp. 175–6. F. B. Notes on C. I. L. IV 1698; on the form *amphitheater* in Petronius, Cena 45; and on a Bonn inscription.—P. 176. Th. Kock. *Nachtrag zu XLVIII,* S. 587, 8.

Pp. 177–93. *Volksthümliches bei Artemidoros.* E. Riess. There are many old popular superstitions and religious notions underlying Artemidorus's interpretations of dreams.

Pp. 194–207. *Sprachliche Beobachtungen zu Plautus.* E. Norden. I. An examination of Plautus's use of *magis* with the comparative. The actual 'double comparative' is found in only three passages, Men. prol. 55, Poen. prol. 83, Pseud. 220–1, which may have been written soon after the time of Terence. Pseud. 218–24 is a very clumsy 'dittography.' II. Amph. prol. 38 contains four deviations from Plautine usage. The two words of the phrase *animum advortere* are never separated except in Pseud. 481 *adverte ergo animum.* But where *ergo* is used with a present imperative it is regularly placed after the verb.

Pp. 208–24. *Zur Echtheitsfrage der Scriptores historiae Augustae.* O. Seeck gives a supplementary list of minor anachronisms in the Historia Augusta in support of Dessau's claim that this composition is a forgery which cannot have been completed before the close of the fourth century. (See A. J. P. XV 383 and 392.)

Pp. 225-46. Zur Chronologie der älteren griechischen Geschichte. J. Toepffer. I. On the wars between Messenia and Sparta. The victors at the Olympian games from 768 to 736 were, with only two exceptions, Messenians; the first Spartan victor appeared in 720, and for the next hundred years Sparta furnished more than half of all the known victors, Messenia none. These striking figures suggest some great change in the relative power of Messenia and Sparta towards the end of the eighth century. Tyrtaeus tells of two great wars waged between these states, in each of which the Spartans were victorious; one of them was fought in his own day, the other, two generations before (*πατέρων ἡμετέρων πατέρες*). The second war seems to have broken out about the middle of the seventh century. II. On the struggles between Athens and Aeolis for the possession of Sigeum.

Pp. 247-55. Zu Valerius Maximus und Iauarius Nepotianus. M. Ihm shows the importance of the Historia Miscella for the textual criticism of Valerius Maximus.

Pp. 256-69. Die Gründung von Tyros. F. Rühl.

Pp. 270-4. Zur Composition des Tibull. E. Wölfflin illustrates the artistic structure of the elegies of Tibullus by an examination of the sequence and proportion of the thoughts in the first, third and tenth poems of the first book. The third elegy shows not only the unity of a dominant sentiment, but also a carefully balanced strophic symmetry.

Pp. 275-98. Die Stadtgründung der Flavier. H. Nissen. A commentary on Pliny, N. H. III 65-7, and on Tacitus, Ann. XV 39-41. The *tanta resurgentis urbis pulchritudo* was due less to Nero than to Vespasian (C. I. L. VI 931; Sueton. 9). N. finds a mystical connection between the restoration of the city and the Roman notion of the *saecula*. Vespasian and Titus undertook the duties of the censorship in A. U. C. 826. On the Palilia of that year the city had completed $7\frac{1}{2}$ *saecula* of 110 years, or 25 generations of 33 years; 2 *saecula* had passed since the celebration of A. U. C. 605; etc. Pliny gives the circumference of the city as 13,200 (= 110 × 120, or 440 × 30) paces; the number of its gates as 37 (= $\frac{1}{2}$ of 110); etc. Vespasian did not materially increase the *pomerium*.

Pp. 299-308. Ueber eine alte Thierfabel. O. Crusius. An ancient fable which teaches that an assumed character is not maintained under temptation. A certain Egyptian king had trained a troop of apes to dance the *πυρρίχη*. The performers were arrayed in masks and purple robes, and the dance proceeded with all dignity until a waggish spectator threw some nuts upon the stage. This story is quoted by Lucian, Pisc. 36, against the false philosophers of his day, and a similar one by Gregory of Nyssa against insincere Christians. Cf. Lucian, Adv. Indoct. 4 *πιθηκος γάρ δὲ πιθηκος, η παροιμία φρσι, καν χρνσα εχγ σάμβαλα* (MSS *σύμβολα*). The fable may have been as old as Archilochus, Fragn. 89, 93: Lycambes and Neobule showed their true character as soon as a wealthier suitor appeared.

Miscellen.—Pp. 309-10. P. Wendland. Betogene Betrüger.—Pp. 310-13. G. Knaack. Zur Meleagersage.—Pp. 313-16. E. Preuner. Zur Einführung

des Asklepios-Kultes in Athen.—Pp. 316-17. M. Ihm. Zur Collatio legum Mosaicarum et Romanarum.—Pp. 317-20. E. Lattes. 1. Umbr. Naharkum Naharcer, ital. Narce. 2. Etr. lat. $\delta\beta\alpha\zeta$.

Pp. 321-52. Der hellenische Bund des Jahres 371 v. Ch. H. Swoboda. The object of the Athenians in calling together the Hellenic congress of B. C. 371 (Xen. Hellen. VI 5) was an extension of the naval confederacy to include certain states which had previously followed the lead of Sparta but were now beginning to waver.

Pp. 353-61. Aethiopien. W. Schwarz. A chapter in the early history of the ivory trade.

Pp. 362-78. Aus griechischen Inschriften zu attischen Münzen. E. Preuner. I. Τιμόστρατος-Ποσῆς auf attischen Tetradrachmen. II. Die Chariten auf der attischen Münzerie Εύρυκλει(θης)—Αριαρά(θης). III. Die attischen Strategen als Jahresbeamte auf den Münzen?

Pp. 379-423. Zur Topographie des Quirinals. (Hierzu eine Karte.) Ch. Hülser.

Pp. 424-60. Die griechischen Trostbeschlüsse. K. Buresch. A study of the φήμισμα παρασθητικόν. Specimens have been found in Caria, in the Milesian colony of Olbia, at Epidaurus and Naples, but especially in Amorgos. The number and the stereotype form of the decrees found in this island suggest that they are the product of a very popular custom. A long preamble sets forth the hero's accomplishments, the respectability of his family, his upright life, his popularity, and the sorrow of the community at his death; this is followed by the consolation officially offered to his mourning relatives and friends and a list of the public honors decreed to his memory. The grounds on which consolation is offered are regularly given: fate is inexorable, and it is wise to bear with patience what cannot be avoided. The language abounds in rhetorical ornaments, sentimental flourishes and striking figures: in one inscription "the entire city, the infant children not excepted, is distressed at the loss of its fairest ornament." This kind of decree cannot be older than the Hellenistic period—it was contrary to the old Hellenic spirit to make public matter of private concerns;—indeed, in its peculiar development, it could only be produced by the Greek spirit when, under the Roman sway, this had been withdrawn from all real political activity and merged in local or provincial interests.

Pp. 461-71. Pasparios. H. Usener. Πασπάριος is given by Hesychius as a name under which Apollo was worshipped in Paros and in Pergamum. The word is derived from the prefix παν- and a root σπαρ- or σκαρ- which expressed unsteady motion and appears in σπαίρειν, σκαίρειν, σκιρτᾶν, ἀσπαλινεῖν, etc. This root was employed in Greek at an early period to denote the glimmer of the light, and a similar use of it is found in the Sanskr. stems sphur, sphar, sphal; in O. H. G. spilōn, M. H. G. spiln, G. spielen; in Lat. coruscare (vulgar Lat. scoruscare). Cf. Götting. Paroemiogr. I, 114 λύκος περὶ φρέαρ χορεῖει, where it is the light, not the wolf, that dances about the water. From the unconscious poetry of this usage arose the old popular belief in the dancing of the

sun at his rising on certain mornings; and in this popular belief is found the origin and meaning of the primitive sword-dance, with which we may compare the weapon-dance of the Κούρητες in the service of the infant Zeus, Apollo and Dionysos-Zagreus. The legend of the Σπαρτοί of Thebes is due to folk etymology: they were originally Σπάρτοι 'dancers.' To the Italians Mars was the god of the year; he was himself a 'dancer.' *Salisubsubulus*, and his priests *Salii*. Pasparios is the god that dances through all things with his light. Asklepios was, like his father Apollo, a god of the light; the stem-syllable *σκαλ* is visible in his Latin name *Aesculapius*. Even Hekate was sometimes worshipped under the name 'Ασπαλίς.'

Miscellen.—P. 472. O. R. proposes to read (1) in Aesch. Agam. 201 ff. K: πανσανέμον γὰρ θυσίας παρθενίου θ' αἰματός (αὐδῆ περιωργῶς) ἐπιθυμεῖν θέμις; εὐ γὰρ εἰη; (2) in Ar. Ran. 839 ἀπορολαλητόν, i. e. ἀπόρα λαλοῦντα, for the MSS ἀπεριλάλητον.—Pp. 473-6. Fr. Susemihl. 1. Die Chronologie des älteren Astydamas. 2. Aphareus und Timokles. 3. Spintharos von Herakleia. 4. Zu Vit. Soph., p. 128, 42 ff. W.—Pp. 476-8. G. Knaack. Zur Meleager-Sage. Nachtrag zu S. 310.—P. 478. H. Diels. Pseudonaevianum.—Pp. 479-80. M. Ihm states that the MS reading of Tac. Ann. I 34 is really *seque et proximos* etc., the *et* being represented by a sign which is found also at Ann. III 44, between *an* and *sacrovirum*.—P. 480. R. Seymour Conway. Neue oskische Inschrift.

Pp. 481-525. Zwei neue Reden des Choricius. R. Foerster. The two speeches which are here published for the first time are preserved in a Madrid MS, N-101. They are of especial interest (1) because they are the work of the author's youth, (2) because the *diaλέξεις* to them have been preserved. Much attention has been paid to *ἱθοποίᾳ*, and they abound in *γνῶμαι*. A certain miser wishes his son to marry a girl who is rich but homely; the young man is in love with a maiden who is poor but beautiful. The enemy attacks the city and the youth wins the prize for valor; for his reward he chooses the beautiful girl. In the first speech the son justifies his choice before the Ecclesia, in the second we have the father's counter-argument.

Pp. 526-31. Harpalyke. G. Knaack. A supplementary note to O. Crusius' article on Harpalyke in Roscher's Lexikon d. griech. u. röm. Mythologie.

Pp. 532-58. Anecdota medica Graeca. R. Fuchs. Der cod. Paris. suppl. Graec. 636. I. Inhaltsangabe. II. Collation von fol. 102 v-105 v zu dem Kanon des Maximus Planudes. III. Inedita medica.

Pp. 559-76. Autor- und Verlagsrecht im Alterthum. K. Dziatzko. The ancient author might sell his compositions, or he might dedicate them to some rich patron in the hope of profiting by his gifts; but when they once passed out of his hands he retained no rights in them. We cannot infer from Cicero's letter to Atticus, XIII 12, that he was in the habit of securing remuneration from the sale of his published works, a remuneration proportioned to the extent of the sales; in §2 he expresses his satisfaction, not with an account of sales rendered for the *Pro Ligario*, but with the wide publicity which Atticus has given to this speech. *Praemium libellorum* in Mart. X 74, 7 means only the gifts of the patron to whom his work was dedicated. The ancient

publisher enjoyed no protection under the law, and might always expect the competition of unauthorized editions of a popular work. We cannot infer from Sen. De Benef. VII 6, 1 that Dorus had bought the right of publishing Cicero's works; Dorus was primarily a *librarius*, who had probably secured good texts of Cicero and Livy and made copies of their writings for sale. In the second half of the fourth century Symmachus writes to Ausonius (Ep. I 31 [25]): *cum semel a te profectum carmen est, ius omne posuisti; oratio publicata res libera est.* The principal French and German literature on this subject is mentioned on pp. 559-60.

Pp. 577-611. *Zur Datirung des delphischen Paean und der Apollo-Hymnen.* H. Pomtow. The 'paean' was composed about 230-20 B.C. (certainly between 235 and 210 B.C.); the four hymns were cut in the marble walls of the Thesaurus by Delphic stone-cutters at different times, at the earliest about 200, but probably between 185 and 135 B.C.

Pp. 612-19. *Das Regenwunder der Marc Aurel-Säule.* A. v. Domaszewski. The scene on the Antonine column in which the rain-god hovers over the Roman forces must represent an event which happened in the early part of the war; it cannot commemorate the miraculous victory over the Quadi in the year 174. The statement of Xiphilinus that the empress Faustina received the title *mater castrorum* after the victory is an interpolation. There is little evidence of the existence of a Christian legion in those days; it is not likely that the Christians enlisted in large numbers, and the inscriptions show no trace of Christianity in the Roman army all through the third century.

Miscellen.—Pp. 620-3. J. M. Stahl. *Zu Aeschylos' Choephoren* (a new distribution of vv. 498-511).—Pp. 623-5. E. Rohde. I. Theopompos the historian was born in 376 B.C. II. In Parthenius, cap. 36 extr., we may read *τέλος δὲ σίτα καὶ ποτὰ μὴ προσιεμένη διὰ λύπην ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀπηλλάγη.*—Pp. 625-7. H. Rabe. *Γλῶσσαι* (from codex Marc. gr. 433).—Pp. 627-9. H. Pomtow. *Zur Datirung der Halle der Athener zu Delphi.* The *terminus ante quem* is 490 B.C.—Pp. 629-30. Ch. Hülsen. *Zu Martial, II 17.*—Pp. 630-2. O. Seeck. *Die gallischen Steuern bei Ammian (XVI 5, 14).*

HAVERFORD COLLEGE.

WILFRED P. MUSTARD.

PHILOLOGUS, XLIX (1890).

I, pp. 1-16 and XI, pp. 213-29. In the first of these articles H. Dünzter attacks the extreme view of Wilamowitz (*Phil. Unters.*, Heft 7, Berlin, 1884) on the present condition of *Odyssey*, book I. The discussion, which revives a similar one with Kirchhoff and Köchly in 1872, is taken up point by point and argued with considerable heat. In his second article Dünzter discusses Bärwinkel (*Prg.* 1889), who represents the other extreme of the text at any price, and Scotland (*Philol.* 46 and *JJ.* 1888), who attempts a compromise. At the close Dünzter gives a list of such lines as he considers genuine.

II, pp. 17-25. How are we to account for the present condition of the history of Thukydides? With regard to this much-discussed question W.

Schmid concludes: That the author died before completing his work, and hence that the sketchiness of bk. II, 25-29 and of portions of bk. V, the absence of speeches in bk. VIII, etc., are not due to a "stupid editor" (Wilamowitz), but are original. The question therefore is to discover the editor of the work. Schmid declares for Kratippos and clinches his argument by substituting *καραλειφθέντα* for *παραλειφθέντα* in the notice of Dionysios on Kratippos. The date of publication was later than 387 B. C.

P. 25. E. Kurtz quotes Hesych., s. v. *δνος* in explanation of the obscure proverb *Εἰς δνον κίλιμα μὴ εἰσέρχεσθαι*.

III, pp. 26-37. R. Unger emends passages in several of the Latin poets.

IV, pp. 38-48. O. E. Schmidt arranges and dates twelve letters, forming, "perhaps with some others," *M. T. Ciceronis Epist. ad M. Brutum, Lib. I.* Means for reconstruction are: references in Cicero's extant letters, especially *ad Atticum*, references in his other works, notably the rhetorical, and citations from lost letters, most of which will be found in Servius, Quintilian, Nonius and Priscian.

V, pp. 49-64. Die Tuskulanen im Cod. Vat. 3246 (9th cent.). A new collation by E. Ströbel.

VI, pp. 65-88. Die Anfänge des julianischen Kalendars. L. Holzapfel. The question proposed is, which years were bissextile according to Caesar's own view, and which years were actually reckoned as such? Also, what was the date when Augustus instituted the cycle as it now stands? This is an obscure matter, and is treated here in a manner peculiarly vexatious to the unmathematical mind. The author's answer appears to be: Caesar's cycle began A. U. C. 709 (Varro), Feb. 25, B. C. 45. The intercalary day was retroactive—that is, was not inserted until the time for it had accumulated. He intended to have it fall on Feb. 25, 713, 717, etc., but the pontifices misunderstood his directions "quarto quoque anno," etc., and made 712 a leap-year—also 713, according to Dion Cassius. They then had to reduce 714 to 364 days in order to avoid the prodigy of a collision of the *Nundinae* with New Year's. After this they went on with regular triennial leap-years until the reform of Augustus, A. U. C. 761 (A. D. 8). This makes leap-year as now a number divisible by four, according to our era.

VII, pp. 89-120 and XL, pp. 707-35. Lesbiaka, by K. Tümpel. In the first of these articles, Chryseis—Apriate, Tümpel shows that the city Chryse to which Chryseis (Il. A 366) was finally returned (*Odyss. a 430-87*) was located in Lesbos. He even finds here the necessary Smintheus cult, but "only in the form of a founder-legend, according to which the hero, at the command of the Delphian oracle, leaves the Peloponnesus with the Penthilidae." There was also an old Lesbian cult of Χρυσῆ, i. e. Aphrodite (Schol. Il. 3, 64, etc.). Χρυσῆ = Καλή, and Καλλονή is an old name of Aphrodite still preserved in the modern κόλπος τῆς Καλλονῆς, upon which stood the old Arisba and probably the Chryse of Homer. Euphorion (*Parthen. 26*) read the much-disputed ἀπριατήν (*Odyss. § 316*, Il. A 98) as a substantive appellation of Chryseis, and when he told a Lesbian story of Apriate, knew that he was referring to the Homeric Chryseis, and had an oral tradition older than any one of the main-

land to explain Homer's Chryse. The general inference is that the Thessalian Pelasgi moved towards the Troad by way of Lesbos.

In his second article, 'Kabiri, Kadmilos and the Pelasgi in Lesbos,' Tümpel concludes that: The double terminology (arising from Hellanikos) of Πελασγοι (e. g. of the Lesbian Pylaion) and of Τυρσηνοι (e. g. of the Lesbian Metaon) remains a problem. But, on the whole, it is now and then recognizable that the Tyrrheno-Pelasgic population of Lesbos was closely united in language and culture with the Pelasgi of Thessaly, as also with the Tyrrhenians of Lemnos, Samothrake, Imbros and Italy.

P. 120. O. Crusius has a short note on *Ischys* and *Ischenos*.

VIII, pp. 121-33. G. F. Unger sets the date of Mantinea on Aug. 2, 363 B. C., instead of in June-July, 362.

IX, 134-80 and XVII, 338-75. Herbst finishes his valuable review of the literature on Thukydides.

P. 180. Haeberlin emends Lysias, XIII 4, and p. 181, Thrak. IV 9.

P. 181. Miscellen.—Buchner, Aristides; M. Treu, Planudes Prov. in Barocclanus 68; Lattmann, Cic. De Leg. I, 52 and Manitius, Eutropius im Mittelalter.

X, pp. 193-212. O. Immisch offers some emendations of the Greek lyric poets.

P. 212. R. Ellis emends Cleobulina, Frag. 3, and p. 270, Catull. 64, 109.

XII, pp. 230-9. E. Rohde, on the testimony of 174 D-175 B, puts the composition of Plato's Theaetetus at not earlier than 371 B. C.

XIII, pp. 240-70. L. Mendelssohn. Critical and exegetical notes on the Oracula Sibyllina.

XIV, pp. 271-84 and XXXV, pp. 649-61. C. Haeberlin. Notes critical, etc., on the Carmina figurata Graeca.

XV, pp. 285-312. E. Klebs finds that imitations of Velleius are found mainly in Sulp. Severus, especially the Chronicle. There are eight in the Histories of Tacitus and one or two each in Solinus and the so-called Hegesippus. Both his subject and his style would make Velleius an unlikely model for any one.

P. 312. A. Schöne emends Tac. Hist. I, 31, 2.

XVI, pp. 313-37. Under the title Διὰ Καλλιστράτον, K. Zacher attacks the two extreme views of Briel and Hiller on the probable connection of Aristophanes with Kallistratos and Philonides. Z. thinks that the relation was similar to that of author and manager. Kallistratos was very likely the responsible party in case any legal complications should ensue. Looked at from this point of view, Zacher's illustration of the responsible editor of a German newspaper is instructive.

Pp. 376-84. Miscellen.—B. Todt, Aesch. Prom.; R. Peppmüller, Plat. Sympos.; A. Sonny, Avien. or. mar. 340 and 362; Manitius, Pliny the Elder in the Middle Ages.

XVIII, pp. 384-9. E. Rohde. Critical notes on the fragments of the *Θεοσοφία*.

Pp. 389, 478, 492, 612, 674 and 706. M. Petschenig emends different passages of Ammianus.

XIX, pp. 390-9. L. Cohn. Handschriftliches zu Dionys von Halicarnass.

XX, pp. 400-20. R. Reitzenstein. Zu den Quellen des sog. Etymolog. Magnum. Continued from vol. 48, p. 450.

XXI, pp. 421-56. A. Schimberg. Zur hdschr. Ueberlief. der Scholia Didymi. Critical notes, relation of MSS, etc.

Pp. 456, 514 and 680. J. Stich emends passages in Dion Chrysostom.

XXII, pp. 457-68. E. Kurtz. Zu den Παροιμίαι δημώδεις. References, parallels, etc.

XXIII, pp. 469-78. M. Kiderlin emends several passages in Quintilian, Book XI. To be continued.

XXIV, pp. 479-92. E. Meyer (Die Heimath der Ionier. Eine Replik) insists that nothing for older Greek history can be learned from the legend of Ion. The settlement on the west coast of Asia Minor was not caused, as is now believed, though the ancients knew nothing of it, by an irruption of mountain tribes upon the civilized states of Greece. It has nothing in common with the Dorian migration or anything connected with it. It was a product of the 'Mycenaean' age, and was caused simply by overflow of population, the constant factor in colonization throughout Greek history.

XXV, pp. 493-506. H. Landwehr enquires into the details of the famous impeachment of Pausanias by the Ephors, and the method of procedure in such cases.

P. 506. A. Wiedemann has a note on the 'Nomos Phaturites' (Pliny, N. H. 5, 49).

XXVI, pp. 507-14. A. Thimme thinks that Lucian's point of view did not allow of his being fair towards Alexander of Abonuteichos. This man "was not a pure, truth-loving character, but as a priest was no more gifted and no more unprincipled than the rank and file of his brethren in other temples."

XXVII, pp. 514-47. H. Kallenberg examines the use of the article in Greek prose with names of countries, cities and seas. In later Greek, of course, the bugbear of hiatus must be taken into consideration. Even syntax and usage have to bend to it. In general, only those countries take the article that are distinctly recognizable as adjectives (Meisterhans). Conversely, the words *χώρα* and *γῆ* may only be added to such words. They cannot, like *πόλις*, *ποταμός* and *δρός*, be added to *any* word. The 'chorographic' genitive takes the article unless the whole precedes the part. This does not hold good for Herodotus. As a rule the article is not used with names of cities (Blass). Exceptions in Herodotus usually have a demonstrative force, referring to the same name already mentioned, or are used like the Latin *ille* 'that famous,' etc. The article with Rome (as with Sparta) is the rule. In speaking of *strange* cities, rivers or mountains, the Greeks were fond of adding *πόλις*,

ποταμός, etc. "Education in Greece was not obligatory, and geography was not a strong point." The author might have added that to-day geography is a subject about which the vast majority of even educated men know next to nothing. Kallenberg's investigation is a wholesome warning to those Dutch editors who strike out a *πόλις* or a *ποταμός* wherever they see it.

P. 547. O. Crusius adds to Wessely's *Ephesia Grammata*.

XXVIII, pp. 548-53. G. H. Müller decides that the Greek optative was a mood of desire in the past. Then *ἀν* ('aliqua ratione') was added, and the optative, by a certain confusion, came to be considered almost a mood of the present. Hence it was finally used in dependent sentences in place of the subjunctive or indicative.

XXIX, pp. 554-64. Manitius. Claudian in the Middle Ages. See XLVII, p. 710.

Pp. 565-74. Miscellen.—Todt, Aesch. Persae, emend.; Koch, Claudian, emend. (to be contin.); Crusius, Criticism of Stowasser's deriv. of *persona* (Wien. Stud. 12, 156); Tümpel, Remark on Διάνυσος Σμύνθιος; Dittrich-Fabricius, Zu Xen. Hellen. und Anab.

XXX, pp. 577-606. T. Baunack. On the Inscriptions from the *Asklepieion* of Lebena (Crete). With facsimile.

XXXI, pp. 607-12. R. Meister. On the dialect and origin of the Greek population of Eryx and Segesta.

XXXII, pp. 613-28. E. Zarncke. Analecta Murbacensia. Catalogue of the Library (1464).

XXXIII, pp. 629-44. H. Heisterbergh reviews and rejects all former explanations of the word *Provincia*. Whenever this word is used officially it is always associated with the idea of drawing lots (*sors*, *evenit*, etc.). *Vincere* is habitually used in the same connection. From this is derived *vicia* (Festus) = *sors*. *Provincia* is a word like *proportio*, *praetor*, etc. Expressions such as *provincia evenit*, etc., were originally *pro viciā evenit*. *Provincia* therefore should be defined as 'any political function conferred by lot.'

XXXIV, pp. 645-8. R. Peppmüller. Critical notes on Hesiod, Theog. 820-35.

XXXVI, pp. 662-8. F. Cauer. Critical and exegetical notes on Theognis.

XXXVII, pp. 669-74. A. Funck. Critical notes on the Bellum Africum.

XXXVIII, pp. 675-80. Crusius. Apuleiana. Critical.

XXXIX, pp. 680-706. H. Heller reviews the literature on Caesar's Comm. up to 1889.

Pp. 736-52. Miscellen.—Schneider, Colluthea; Roscher, Zu den Hymni Mag.; Dittrich, Frag. of Theon's Com. on the Alexandra of Lycophron; Koch, Claudian, emend.; Wessely, Readings from the Vienna MS of Orpheus, Argon. (con. from XLVIII 576); O. Gruppe, Note on Ba'al Ziphon (see XLVIII 487).

KIRBY F. SMITH.

REVUE DE PHILOGIE. Vol. XVII.

No. I.

1. Pp. 1-10. The poet Sophocles and the Oligarchy of the Four Hundred, by P. Foucart. An attempt to show that the Sophocles who, as one of the $\pi\rho\theta\betaou\lambdaoi$, voted for the establishment of the Four Hundred, was the poet. The article contains an interesting discussion of the political events concerned, but brings forward no new facts to favor the view defended.

2. Pp. 10-13. Correction of thirty-eight passages in the $\Pi\epsilon\rho\mu\acute{\iota}\xi\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ of Alexander of Aphrodisias, by G. Rodier. These corrections are in most cases entirely convincing.

3. Pp. 14-28. On our text of the Phaedo, by Paul Couvreur. The author explains the principles by which he was guided, and the changes that he introduced into his text of the Phaedo. I. First he discusses the value of the papyrus of Mr. Flinders Petrie, and joins the ranks of its defenders. He then adds a long list of readings of the papyrus which he has preferred to those of other MSS. II. Next, regarding the papyrus as the highest authority and so following its guidance, he finds, first, that the MSS of the second family have an authority almost equal to that of the first; secondly, that several readings found in ancient quotations are to be preferred to those of the MSS. He gives a considerable list of instances. He then discusses, and illustrates by several examples, the usefulness of ancient Latin versions of parts of Plato. III. Finally he enumerates the comparatively few emendations proposed by modern critics, including himself, which he has received into his text.

4. P. 28. Note by L. Havet on Cic. pro Caelio 24, showing that there was a *gens Coponia*, as implied by the interpolation in S (Munich). Cf. Cic. pro Balbo 53.

5. Pp. 29-32. On the monosyllabic ending of the *senarius* in Terence, by Philippe Fabia. The statements of metricalians are inaccurate. A careful analysis of the statistics shows that in the second, third and fourth plays Terence more carefully avoided this ending than in the first, but in the sixth (Adelphoe) became more lax again. The final monosyllable is always exceptional (about one in thirty verses); three-fourths of the examples show forms of *esse* closely connected with the preceding word; in the remaining fourth there is close nexus; in the prologues this monosyllable is absolutely excluded.

6. Pp. 33-47. On sentences ending in a word of two half-feet in Cic. de Oratore, by Louis Havet. I. Final words of the form $\text{---}\text{U}$ or UUU . Just before these endings Cicero employs usually the form $\text{---}\text{U}$ or UUU , frequently $\text{---}\text{U}$ or UUU , very rarely --- , never $\text{---}\text{U}$ nor $\text{U}\text{U}\text{---}$ or UUU . In the discussion of this subject, several striking emendations are proposed. II. Final words of the form UU . This ending is usually preceded by --- , more rarely by $\text{---}\text{U}$, the anapaest is doubtful, the dactyl and trochee excluded. Here too some textual criticism is offered.

7. Pp. 48-55. The Constitution of Athens before Draco, according to Aristot. $\pi\omega\lambda.$ 'A θ . I-III, by B. Haussoullier. Introduction, text of chapters I-III, and explanatory notes.

8. Pp. 56-62. On certain points in the history of the Seleucids, by G. Radet. I. In Boeckh, C. I. G. 3595, l. 22, in reference to Antiochus I (Soter), occurs the expression *τῆς ἀδελφῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλίσσης*. According to Droysen, *ἀδελφή* here is only a title of rank. It is denied by others that such a title ever existed. Radet shows that in this case the word may have its natural sense, but that it was used at the Syrian court as a title of honor. II. Next he shows that the statement of Stephanus Byzantinus concerning the founding of Laodicea, Nysa, and Antioch by Antiochus, son of Seleucus, may refer to Antiochus I (rather than III) and still be true. III. He shows that the Ptolemy mentioned in Josephus, Ant. Jud. XII 3, 3 (*Βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος Πτολεμαῖος χαίρειν*, etc.), was Ptolemy, son of Thraseas.

9. P. 62. L. Havet, in view of the fact that *bacca* is barbarous and that the true form is *baca*, proposes *vacca* in Priscian, II 6.

10. Pp. 63-78. On Greek works on stones (*lapidaires*), by F. de Mély and H. Courel. The present article, which is to be continued, treats of the reproduction of Greek works in the Arabic of the Middle Ages. Many curious and interesting facts are brought to light, and the etymological investigator will find some instructive transformations of words, resulting from the attempt to transcribe them with Arabic letters, and, in some cases, to transcribe them again from the Arabic with Roman letters. It was thus, for instance, that Xenocrates had himself mistaken for a stone, and his name transformed into *Azufaratz*.

11. Pp. 79-98. Epigraphic Bulletin: review of epigraphic works, by B. Haussoullier. This article examines only Greek inscriptions or works treating of them. 1) The first work noticed is *Griechische Epigraphik*, von Dr. W. Larfeld, forming part of vol. I of the *Handbuch der klassischen Alterthums-wissenschaft*, 2d ed., 1892. A careful analysis of the book is given, and the merits of each part separately discussed. The reviewer finds fault with the method, but does not question the ability of the author. In spite of the objectionable features, he finds the work of great importance and utility for epigraphists. 2) Next the reviewer takes up vol. I of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum Graeciae Septentrionalis*, of which he presents a thorough analysis, enumerating some of the important historical results. He adds a similar analysis of the second fascicle of R. Dareste, B. Haussoullier, Th. Reinach, *Recueil des inscriptions juridiques grecques*. 3) Finally he criticizes briefly other works (including articles) that touch upon Greek epigraphy, such as Meyer's *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte*; Ziebarth, *De iure iurando in iure Graeco*; Emil Szanto, *Das griechische Bürgerrecht*; Milchhöfer, *Untersuchungen über die Demenordnung des Kleisthenes*; Sandys, *Aristotle's Constitution of Athens*. He promises an elaborate review of the last-named work, and gives a brief analysis of the others, with estimates of their value.

12. Pp. 99 f. Book Notices. 1) B. H. apologizes for the failure of G. Rodier, in his article on Alexander Aphrodisensis de Mixtione, to use J. Bruns, *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis praeter commentaria scripta minora*, Berlin, 1892. 2) G. Rodier analyzes and commends M. Wallies, *Die griech. Ausleger der Aristotel. Topik*, Berlin, 1891. 3) C. E. R. highly commends Georg Wentzel, *Die Goettinger Scholien zu Nicanders Alexipharmacum* (in vol. 36, *Abhandlungen der kön. Gesellschaft der Wiss. zu Goettingen*), Goettingen, 1892.

No. 2.

1. Pp. 101-8. The *Fabulae Praetextae*, by Gaston Boissier. The classical name was 'praetextae,' the name 'praetextatae' an invention of grammarians. The mention of one of these *Fabulae* by Asinius Polio (Cic. Ep. X 32) and other considerations indicate that they were 'pièces de circonstance, composées pour une fête particulière, en mémoire d'un événement ou d'un anniversaire important.' They bore a stronger resemblance to the historical plays of Shakespeare than to the *Persae* of Aeschylus; but they were not intended to be of permanent interest.

2. P. 108. P. Couvreur points out that Proclus in *Cratylum*, schol. 60, contains a brief, but not literal, quotation from Parmenides.

3. Pp. 109-15. Unpublished fragments of a commentary on the *Iliad*, by Jules Nicole. These fragments, or more properly this fragment, of 20 more or less defective lines, divided into three parts, the author finds to be a commentary on Il. XX 144-50. Some expressions point to the *Tρωϊκά* of Hellanicus, others to the *Tρωϊκὸς διάκοσμος* of Demetrius of Scepsis, as the original source.

4. Pp. 116-19. Critical discussion of eight passages of Quintilian, by Max Bonnet.

5. Pp. 120-8. The Greek lapidarii in the Arabic literature of the Middle Ages, by F. de Mély and H. Courel. This is the second part of the article named above (No. 1, p. 63 ff. of Rev. d. Phil.). The article consists of a discussion of ninety-five names of stones, arranged alphabetically. These names are Arabic corruptions of Greek words.

6. Pp. 129-31. On "Deus noster Caesar" in the Compositions of Scribonius Largus, by Camille Jullian. The expression occurs twice (of Claudius), and emendation into *dominus noster* is excluded by the occurrence of *divinae manus* (of the same emperor). It would appear, then, that a sort of deification of the emperor, at least among his domestics and clients, had taken place at an earlier date than is usually supposed.

7. Pp. 132-40. On the lyric metres of Horace, by René Pichon. The object of this article is to determine the relation of metre to subject-matter and tone. The following is a mere table of contents. I. In the epodes the iambics are used in satire, a mixture of iambics and dactyls in 'Anacreontic' poems. II. The Alcaic stanza is used in national and other great odes. Even *Nunc est bibendum* is no exception, for it probably was composed for a banquet that celebrated the victory over Antony and Cleopatra. III. The Asclepiadeans deal with love, friendship and the like. IV. The Sapphic stanza, employed more frequently in the latter years of the poet, treats of subjects common to both the preceding metres, but is more calm and subdued. V. Horace probably adopted a transmitted usage in the case of the Asclepiadeans, but he himself assigned special uses to the Alcaics and the Sapphics. The forms of the two stanzas are well adapted to the ends to which he applied them. VI. In thus determining and observing the ethos of the different metres, Horace shows himself an artist in the true sense of the word.

8. Pp. 141-58. On clauses ending in a word of the form —— ˘, or a group of the form —, — ˘, in Cic. de Oratore, by Louis Havet. Before this ending

Cicero (like Symmachus four and a half centuries later) uses the trochee or tribrach, excludes the spondee, dactyl and anapaest, the cretic and fourth paeon. The author gives exhaustive lists of examples and discusses exceptions. He proposes many ingenious emendations, some of which are convincing. [One cannot, however, accept all these emendations without tacitly admitting that the aggregate of all corruptions must be enormous, if thirteen instances each of the cretic and the spondee before the bacchic ending have thus originated.]

9. Pp. 159 f. Michel Bréal discusses an inscription of Mantinea.

10. P. 159. Herwerden reads *βόσκει* in Soph. Ph. 1161.

11. Pp. 161-3. The bridge over the Cephisus: correction of Anthology, IX 147, by P. Foucart. This article shows conclusively that, in the inscription named, Ξενοκλῆς ὁ Ξείνιδος is to be read for Ξ. ὁ Λινδος, and that Xenocles of Lindos, the architect, never existed.

12. Pp. 164-70. On the consulship of Tacitus, by Philippe Fabia. The traditional opinion was that Tacitus was consul in 97. Julius Asbach's attempt to prove that it was in 98 is generally considered successful. E. Klebs combats the latter view, and in this article Fabia comes to his support with additional evidence.

13. Pp. 171-85. On the chronology of the Rhodian inscriptions, by Maurice Holleau. This searching and learned investigation does not admit of condensation.

14. Pp. 185 f. Paul Tannery shows that in Aristot. Mechan. 855 a, 36, *τριπλῆ* (i. e. γ') should be read for *γωνία*, and in 851 b, 24 and 40, *γραμμή* should probably be read for *γωνία*: certainly something equivalent to *περιφέρεια*.

15. P. 187. J. Keelhoff defends some examples of *παρά τινι* after verbs of motion.

16. Pp. 188-90. Epigraphic Bulletin, by B. Haussoullier. Text of an important inscription embodying a rescript of Alexander the Great to the Chians. Interesting comments.

17. Pp. 191-2. Ch. Tailliart emends Plaut. Amphitr. 681 so as to read *Et quom te video et quom, etc.*

18. Pp. 192-204. Book Notices. 1) Ed. Tournier mentions favorably Nauck's Tragicae dictionis index spectans ad Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta. 2) B. Auerbach gives an account of Geffcken's Timaios' Geographie des Westens, Berlin, 1892. The criticism is not altogether favorable. 3) Franz Cumont mentions E. Espérandieu's Inscriptions antiques de Lectoure, Paris, 1892, and adds a defence of his own theory concerning the origin of the cult of the Magna Mater and its relations to the Persian cult of Anahita. 4) J. Dianu criticizes rather adversely Carolus Pascal, Studia Philologica, Rome, 1893. 5) Philippe Fabia commends Nipperdey's Tacitus, revised by Georg Andresen, Berlin, 1892. 6) A. Engelbrecht, Patristische Analecten, Vienna, 1892, briefly summarized by §. 7) F. Cumont commends L. Levi, Luciani libellus qui inscribitur Περὶ Περεγρίνου τελευτῆς, Berlin, 1892. 8) Henri

Francotte adversely criticizes H. D. Müller's *Historisch-mythologische Untersuchungen*, Goettingen, 1892. 9) J. Delamarre summarizes and commends Walter Leaf, *A Companion to the Iliad*, London, 1891. 10) P. Couvreur summarizes *Philologische Untersuchungen* (Kiessling and Willamowitz), XII *Aratea*, by E. Mass, Berlin, 1892. He finds this work very instructive, but badly arranged and hard to read. 11) P. Couvreur gives the contents of Émile Chatelain, *Paléographie des classiques latins*, 7e livraison, Paris, 1892. 12) Couvreur finds V. Casagrandi, *Le Orazioni di Tucidide*, Catane, 1892, a convenient but unscientific work.

No. 3.

1. Pp. 197-207. The Roman emperors initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries: P. Foucart. An interesting investigation of the dates, causes of initiation, etc. Several recently discovered inscriptions shed light on the subject.

2. Pp. 208-12. "Betriacum" or "Bebriacum," by Lucien Herr. After a careful examination of the question, the author decides in favor of the latter, but would not substitute it for the former in those works in which the former was obviously written by the author.

3. Pp. 213 f. Paul Tannery, by comparing Pappus, VIII 1026, 2-4, shows that the obscure verses, Manilius *Astronom.* IV 266 f., refer to the construction of the mysterious hydraulic sphere of Archimedes.

4. Pp. 215-51. *Novae commentationes Euripideae*, by H. van Herwerden. This article opens with a list of all the articles and books the author has written on Euripidean criticism. The plays are then taken up in alphabetical order, and a large number of passages emended or critically discussed, from the Alcestis to the end of the Hippolytus. The article is completed in vol. XVIII, No. 1.

5. Pp. 251 f. Éd. Tournier corrects some passages of Babrius.

6. Pp. 253-60. Book Notices. 1) *La Cronologia Romana*, per D. Atto Paganelli, Milano, 1892, scathingly reviewed by A. B.-L. 2) Albert Martin commends Léon Parmentier, *Euripide et Anaxagore*, Paris, 1893. 3) Philippe Fabia favorably mentions P. Jürges, *De Sallustii Historiarum reliquiis capita selecta* (Doctor-dissertation), Goettingen, 1892. 4) L. D. speaks highly of Otto Keller, *Lateinische Volksetymologie und Verwandtes* (1891), and *Lateinische Etymologien* (1893), Leipzig. 5) Émile Boisacq, *Les dialectes doriens*, Paris, 1891, commended by φ. 6) G. Rodier analyzes and highly praises R. Heinze, *Xenocrates: Darstellung der Lehre und Sammlung der Fragmente*, Leipzig, 1892. 7) L. D. calls attention to *Codex Festi Farnesianus* xlii tabulis expressus, ed. Aemilius Thewrewk de Ponor, Budapest, 1893, pronouncing it a magnificent volume.

No. 4.

In this number the *Revue des Revues*, begun in a previous number, is completed.

MILTON W. HUMPHREYS.

BRIEF MENTION.

Some months ago Dr. R. F. WEYMOUTH reprinted from the 'Theological Monthly' for July and Sept., 1890, a paper *On the Rendering into English of the Greek Aorist and Perfect*, being really a counterblast against the havoc which the Revisers have made of the natural feeling of English by trying to render with distressing uniformity the Greek aorist by the English preterite—which was not an aorist, to begin with. It is pleasant to learn from a circular recently received that the light has been welcomed where such light is needed, although it seems rather strange that scholars require to be told that the historical tenses shift from language to language and will not bear mechanical transfer. However, the readers of this Journal, among whom Dr. WEYMOUTH cannot be counted, will remember that Professor Whitney thought it worth his while to enlarge on this subject in a review of Delbrück's Vedic Syntax (A. J. P. XIII 289 foll.), and Dr. Weymouth's illustrations from modern languages will be found interesting. The natural affinity of the aor. for the negative is an old story and has been taken for granted these many years. Hence the shift from perf. to aor. and aor. to perf., which, to be sure, escaped the acumen of Madvig (§112, R. 1). It has long been maintained that 'when the perf. is used as a pres., the aor. is used as a perfect' (A. J. P. IV 429), and this formula has received the approval of Mr. Monro in his Homeric Grammar², p. 67. Nor will it be news to some of us that the Greek perfect differs from the English perfect in that it can be used 'when the further end is dated,' as I have expressed it in my Justin Mart. Apol. I 33, 17. Cf. also II 2, 17 and Isai. 3, 7; Dem. 21, 7; 38, 8, though in these classical examples the position of τότε is to be noted. But the most surprising thing in the pamphlet is the statement that the translation of the Greek present, as in λογορῶ πάλαι, by the English progressive perfect 'has escaped observation.' I can only vouch for the fact that it has been a commonplace of elementary instruction in America for fifty years. From these specimens of the most salient features of Dr. WEYMOUTH's pamphlet, it will hardly be thought necessary to go into further detail, although his statistics might have compelled the attention of syntacticians, if they were not of the eclectic order. Still, it may be worth while to reproduce one set which is based on 'many chapters' of Thukydides and Herodotus (p. 13):

Narrative :	Pres.	His. Pres.	Impf.	Aor.	Perf.	Plpf.	Fut.
Thuc.	5	9	45	34	1	4	2
Herod.	21	1.5	34	32.5	2	1.5	7.5
Non-narrative :							
Thuc.	55	0	8	13	6	0	18
Herod.	55	0	4	19	7	1	14

Unsatisfactory as the basis is, the table will not be without interest as compared with other studies in the proportion of aorist and imperfect (see A. J. P. IV 163, XIV 105, and Dr. Miller's article in the current number); and the small average of the hist. pres. in Herodotus as compared with Thukydides might tempt one to comment on the epic cast of Herodotus' narrative, if one were not afraid of too rapid an induction. Rodemeyer, who has given us a misty and elusive theory of the historical present, has not condescended to give figures, which would be very welcome here.

In his *Vera Historia* Lucian reports a conversation with Homer in which the poet declares that his obelized verses are all his—a joke, which has its serious side, for it has not unfrequently happened that the most interesting works current under an author's name are precisely those that the critics have fallen foul of. And certainly nothing that Philo has written seems to have attracted more popular attention than his description of the Therapeutai in the *de vita contemplativa*, which, of late years, has been relegated to the limbo of forgetfulness. This is the tract which Eusebius cites to prove the existence of Christian monastic orders in the first century, and to this citation is probably due the importance attached to Philo in the Christian church. Indeed Mr. CONYBEARE, in his learned and interesting edition of *Philo, About the Contemplative Life* (Oxford, At the Clarendon Press; New York, Macmillan), goes so far as to suggest that the preservation of Philo's works is a distinct result of this fancy of the Bishop of Caesarea, a fancy which Scaliger calls *tam crassus, tam anilis error*. 'If he had not originated and given vogue to his absurd hypothesis,' says Mr. CONYBEARE, 'the works of Philo might never have been transmitted to us.' That the hypothesis is absurd Mr. CONYBEARE undertakes to show in his *Excursus on the Authorship*, and in so doing he has met and seemingly annihilated the contention of Lucius, who maintains that the work is a Christian forgery intended to bolster monastic institutions. This theory, started in 1880, has been accepted, apparently without any close scrutiny, by a number of leading authorities, and Mr. CONYBEARE has wrought at the problem with a thoroughness that will command respectful attention. The internal evidence from the language as compared with Philo's genuine writings is brought out with the most painstaking exhaustiveness, and though scholars have been found to dispute the genuineness of certain works of the Lucianic corpus on the ground of the slavishness of the imitation, such an argument would hardly apply here. The coincidences are, so to speak, too organic. A fragment of an Old Latin Version and an Armenian Version have been reproduced in this edition for the purpose of establishing the text, and the rich commentary justifies the editor's claim to have explored for himself the literary horizon of the times. True, one misses here and there the classical passages, and it seems a little odd to be referred to Plutarch, *de Iside*, for the combination *ποιηταὶ καὶ λογογράφοι*, without a mention of the source in Thuk. I, 21, and it is to be hoped that

Xenodotus for *Zenodotus*, the Homeric scholar, is an error of the types. A similar error escaped the eye of Krüger in an early edition of the *Anabasis*, where one reads now ΖΕΝΟΦΩΝ, now ΣΕΝΟΦΩΝ, and this Journal is almost always in mourning for typographical sins.

The thesis maintained by Dr. VERRALL in his *Euripides, the Rationalist* (Macmillan) is not merely that Euripides was a rationalist, but that he was a *consistent* rationalist, and not only made use of his characters to discredit the established order of religion, but contrived the plots of his plays so as to bring contempt upon such articles of faith as the resurrection from the dead, the being and attributes of Apollo, and the veracity of the Delphic oracle. Such plays as the *Alkestis*, the *Ion*, the *Iphigeneia among the Taurians* are deliberate mystifications, and the study of Euripides is 'confusion, vexation, waste of spirits and time,' unless one takes the right point of view and stands where one can catch the wink which Euripides tips to the sympathetic unbelievers. Needless to say, the theory is advocated with great ingenuity and unflagging liveliness of style. That Dr. Verrall will carry the world with him to the extent to which he has pushed the accepted doctrine of Euripides' disbelief is doubtful. The perpetual vigilance necessary for following the mocking poet and his agile interpreter will hardly be compensated by the gain of a consistent Euripides. One of the crimes of the old *Collectanea Graeca Minora*—still a textbook in my boyhood—was the early introduction of the student of Greek to Palaephatus, and yet another contemner of the gods whom the pawky Scotch editor brought in to prevent ingenuous youth from worshiping the heathen deities was Lucian. Now if Palaephatus and Lucian—the one with his drybones rationalism, the other with his hollow merriment—are to be our guides to the understanding of Euripides, the older generation of scholars will refuse to join in the quest, and leave investigators of a more modern breed to nose out further impieties in a poet who is first a poet and then, if you choose, a mystifier, and not the other way.

aιγίλιψ is still a puzzle. It occurs I 15 = Π 4 ὥστε κρήνη μελάνυδρος | ή τε κατ' αιγίλιπος πέτρης δνοφερὸν χέει ὑδωρ. Then N 63 ὥστ' ίρης ὡκύπτερος δρῦ πέτεσθαι | δις δέ τ' ἀπ' αιγίλιπος πέτρης περιμήκεος ἀρθεῖς κτε. Instead of going through the list of experiments, I will cite Platt's note on I 15: 'Goebel [Lex. I 18] derives [aigilipos] from *aigis* and *lip-* of λε-λιμ-μένος [*λιμ-ουρία*], etc., to love, explaining "the haunt of storms." This may perhaps be accepted for want of a better. The old explanation was "so steep as to be deserted even by the goats!"' And this old explanation is the explanation still given by PRELLWITZ, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht), a book which has been awaiting its reviewer in this Journal for many moons.

Yet another way is suggested by a passage in a recent work. W. M. Conway, in his *Climbing in the Himalayas*, says (p. 536): 'We ultimately encamped on the glacier near the foot of one of its buttresses, on whose ledges was a little grass. The goats that had been driven up to Footstool Camp were able to feed on this [grass], and had their first good meal for several days, so we named the camp *Goats' Delight*.' This *αιγαλοψ πέτρη* was 15,090 feet high—much higher than is necessary—but one-half tradition, one-half Goebel, would seem to give a very fair sense. Calf Pasture and Cow Pasture are familiar geographical designations in America, and a Goat Pasture Rock gives a very good picture. The rock of wild goats is quite as suitable as the 'wild goats of the rock' (Job 39, 1), and every one knows that the high hills are a refuge for the goats (Ps. 104, 18).

The translation of *Gilbert's Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens* by Messrs. BROOKS and NICKLIN (Macmillan & Co.) will be of service to the ever-lessening number of classical scholars who have not a familiar command of German. The scientific value of the work is pretty much limited to the references supplied by Dr. SANDYS to the introductory chapter on Aristotle's *Constitution of Athens*. To the same sphere of study belongs the first instalment of SUSEMIHL AND HICKS's *Politics of Aristotle* (Macmillan & Co.). The text has been revised by SUSEMIHL and brought into agreement with his late edition (Teubner, 1894). The changes in the notes have been comprehensive and the English collaborator has added a great deal of valuable matter. One reads, however, with dismay that pp. 1-460 had been printed off before the appearance of Mr. Newman's elaborate commentary on the *Politics*, published in 1887, and that these pages had been held back until the whole instalment (689 pp.) was ready. The German *Heft* and *Abteilung* system has its disadvantages, which are keenly felt by scholars of other nationalities, but when one considers the great costliness of English books, it is hard to suppress a sense of impatience at the late issue of a work which, according to modern notions, is half-antiquated at its birth.

I should say that Mr. BLAKE, in his school edition of the *First Two Books of the Hellenica of Xenophon* (Boston, Allyn and Bacon), has taken his task more seriously than the average editor, and I should add that in particular he has shown a praiseworthy disposition to go outside of the ordinary observations of the standard grammars, if in doing so he had not drawn largely on this Journal, so that any word of commendation on my part might seem to be a needless illustration of a vicious circle that has been zealously trodden ever since the beginning of society. I will, however, allow myself to say that many years ago I selected these same two books as a harmless field for syntactical analysis. They are not so interesting as to make the constant intrusion of grammar unbearable, nor yet are they

arid or uninstructive from other points of view. On comparing my MS work with Mr. BLAKE's book I find that he has omitted a good many things that I should have noticed, but that is a matter of judgment. The worst typographical error noticed is the misspelling of Θηραμένης (pp. 96 and 159). The text of the *Hellenica* is followed by selections from *Lysias c. Eratosthenem* (6-20, 62-78) and from Aristotle's Πολ. 'Αθ., cc. XXXIV-XL, a welcome addition to the students of that period of Attic history.

Professor FRIEDRICH HANSEN, of Santiago, has turned his attention from classical philology to Old Spanish, and those who have followed his work in his original domain will look forward to interesting developments in his new field of activity. He has been put in charge of the instruction in the historical grammar of Spanish, in the Instituto Pedagógico—a special honor for a foreigner in a Spanish-speaking country—and one of the first fruits of his studies has already appeared in an elaborate paper, *Sobre la conjugacion de Gonzalo de Berceo*, published in the *Anales de la Universidad*, Santiago de Chile, 1895.

Professor JOSEPH WRIGHT, Deputy Professor of Comparative Philology in the University of Oxford, has issued a prospectus of *The English Dialect Dictionary, being the Complete Vocabulary of all Dialect Words still in use or known to have been in use during the last Two Hundred Years; founded mainly on the Publications of the English Dialect Society and a large amount of material never before printed*. The Dictionary is to be brought out by annual subscription, a guinea a year, in return for which subscribers will receive two half-yearly parts, each published at 15s. to non-subscribers. The minimum number of subscribers required by the editor to begin the work is one thousand, and unless this number is forthcoming the whole scheme of editing the Dictionary will have to be definitely abandoned. Address Professor Joseph Wright, 6 Norham Road, Oxford. No undertaking could appeal more powerfully to American students of English or to American literary men. In our heart of hearts we are all delighted to find warrant for our own naughtinesses and provincialisms in nooks and corners of the old home.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. B. Westermann & Co., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Baker (W.), D. D. Latin and Greek Verse Translations. New York, *Longmans, Green & Co.*, 1895. 7+103 pp. 12mo, cl., \$1.25.

Brinton (D. G.), M. D. A Primer of Mayan Hieroglyphics. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1895. 3+152 pp. 8vo, \$1.20.

Cicero (Marcus Tullius). Cato major; ed. with introd. and notes by Frank Ernest Rockwood. New York, *American Book Co.*, 1895. 159 pp. 12mo, 90 cts.

— De oratore, liber primus; ed. on the basis of Sorof's 2d ed. by W. B. Owen. Boston, *Leach, Shewell & Sanborn*, 1895. 38+195 pp. 16mo, cl., \$1.

Horace. Epodes; ed. with notes by T. E. Page. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1895. 64 pp. 16mo, 50 cts.

Müller (F. Max), Ed. Sacred Books of the East; tr. by various Oriental scholars. V. 36. The Questions of King Milinda; tr. from the Pali by T. W. Rhys Davids. Pt. 2. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1895. 338 pp. 8vo, \$3.25.

— V. 45. Gaina Sûtras; tr. from Prakrit by Hermann Jacobi. Pt. 2. The Uttarâdhayana Sûtra. The Sûtrakritâṅga Sûtra. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1895. 456 pp. 8vo, \$3.25.

Postgate (J. P.), Ed. Corpus poetarum Latinorum, a se aliisque denuo recognitorum, et brevi lectionum varietate instructorum. V. 1. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1895. 8vo, cl., net \$6.

Schreiber (Th.) Atlas of Classical Antiquities; ed. by W. C. F. Anderson, with a preface by Percy Gardner. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1895. 203 pp. 4to, \$6.50.

Smith (H. Percy), Ed. A Dictionary of Terms, Phrases and Quotations. New ed. New York, *Appleton*, 1895. 10+724 pp. 8vo, \$3.

Thucydides. Book 1. Ed., with introd., notes and maps, by W. H. Forbes. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1895. 183 pp. Maps, 8vo, \$2.25.

Tyrrell (R. Y.) Latin Poetry. Boston, *Houghton, Mifflin & Co.*, 1895. 23+323 pp. 12mo, \$1.50.

ENGLISH.

Arabian Nights' Entertainments (The). Translated by Sir Richard Francis Burton. With introduction, explanatory notes and an essay upon the history of the Nights. Ed. by Leonard C. Smithers. 12 vols., roy. 8vo. *H. S. Nichols & Co.* Sub., £6 6s.

- Cicero. *Pro Milone*. Ed., with introduction and commentary, by Albert C. Clark. 8vo, 210 pp. *Clarendon Press*. 8s. 6d.
- Hirschfeld (H.) *Assabiniyya*: a philosophical poem in Arabic by Musa B. Tubi. Edited and translated by H. H. 8vo, 62 pp. *Luzac*. 2s. 6d.
- Maspero (G.) *Manual of Egyptian Archaeology and Guide to the Study of Antiquities in Egypt*. Trans. by Amelia B. Edwards. New ed. Revised and enlarged by the author. With 309 illusts. Cr. 8vo, xxiii + 360 pp. *Grevel*. 6s.
- Philoxenus. *The Discourses of Philoxenus, Bishop of Mabbogh*, A. D. 485-519. Ed. from Syriac MSS. With an English trans. by E. A. Wallis Budge. 2 vols. Vol. 2 (not sold separately). 8vo, half calf. *Asher*. 42s.
- Roberts (C.) *The Zulu-Kafir Language Simplified for Beginners*. 3d ed., enlarged. 8vo. *Paul, Trübner & Co.* Net 6s.
- An English-Zulu Dictionary. 2d ed. 8vo, 290 pp. *Paul, Trübner & Co.* Net 5s.
- Stein (M. A.) Catalogue of the Sanskrit MSS in the Raghunata Temple Library of the Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir. 4to, 423 pp. *Luzac*. 12s.
- Stormonth (Rev. James). *A Dictionary of the English Language*. New ed. Roy. 8vo, hf.-bd., 1298 pp. *Blackwood & Sons*. Net 18s.
- Tarikh-I-Rashidi (The) of Mirza Muhammad Haidar, Dughlāt. An English version. Ed., with commentary, notes and map, by N. Elias. The translation by E. Denison Ross. Demy 8vo, xxiii + 535 pp. *Low*. 31s. 6d.
- Tawney (C. H.) *The Kathakoca*; or, Treasury of Stories. Transl. from Sanskrit manuscripts. With appendix, containing notes, by Ernest Leumann. 8vo, xxiii + 260 pp. *Luzac*. 10s.
- Terence. *Hauton Timorumenos*. With an introduction and notes by J. H. Gray. 12mo, 174 pp. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 3s.
- Vollers (K.) *The Modern Egyptian Dialect of Arabic*. With numerous additions by the author. Trans. by F. C. Burkitt. Cr. 8vo, 282 pp. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 10s. 6d.
- Xenophon's *Anabasis*, VII. Edited for the use of schools. With notes, introductions, vocabulary, illustrations and map. 18mo, 192 pp. *Macmillan*. 1s. 6d.

FRENCH.

- Cicéron. *Choix de lettres*. Texte latin établi et annoté avec une introduction et un lexique historique par J. A. Hild. In-12. *Colin*. Cart., 3 fr.
- Du Rusquec (H.) *Nouveau dictionnaire pratique et étymologique du dialecte de Léon*. In-8. *Leroux*. 15 fr.
- Etienne (E.) *Essai de grammaire de l'ancien français* (IXe au XIVe siècle). In-8. *Berger-Levrault*. 12 fr.
- Hatzfeld (A.), Darmesteter (A.) et Thomas (A.) *Dictionnaire général de la langue française*. Tome I (A-F). Gr. in-8. *Delagrave*. 15 fr.
- Regnaud (Paul). *Éléments de grammaire comparée du grec et du latin*. Première partie : Phonétique. In-8. *Colin*. 8 fr.

GERMAN.

Abhandlungen, Adolf Tobler zur Feier seiner 25jährigen Thätigkeit dargebracht. gr. 8. iii, 510 S. m. 1 Schriftprobe im Text u. 2 Lichtdr. Taf. Halle, *M. Niemeyer.* m. 16.

Abicht (Rud.) Das Lied v. der Heerschaar Igorj's. Abdr. der Editio princeps, nebst altsloven. Transscription u. Commentar. gr. 8. 52 S. L., *R. Gerhard.* m. 1.80.

Abū Abdallah Mohammed ibn Ahmed ibn Jūsof Al-Kātib Al-Khowarezmi. Liber Mafātīh Al-Olūm, explicans vocabula technica scientiarum tam Arabum quam peregrinarum. Ed., indices adjecit G. van Vloten. gr. 8. 7 u. 328 S. Leiden, *E. J. Brill.* m. 9.

Alexandri Lycopolitani contra Manichaei opiniones disputatio, ed. Aug. Brinkmann. 8. xxxi, 50 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 1.

Anthologiae latinae supplementa. Vol. I. 8. L., *B. G. Teubner.*—I. Damasi epigrammata. Recensuit et adnotavit Max Ihm. lii, 147 S. m. 1 Taf. m. 2.40.

Avesta. Die hl. Bücher der Parsen. Hrsg. v. Karl F. Geldner. 8. (Schluss-)Lfg. gr. 4. III: Vendidād, lvi u. S. 81-139. St., *W. Kohlhammer.* m. 12 (kpl., 3 Bde., m. 72).

Baudouin de Courtenay (J.) Versuch e. Theorie phonetischer Alternationen. gr. 8. v, 124 S. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner Verl.* m. 4.

Beiträge, Münchener, zur romanischen u. englischen Philologie. Hrsg. v. H. Breymann u. E. Koeppe. IX. gr. 8. L., *A. Deichert Nachf.*—IX. Methodism in the Light of the English Literature of the Last Century. By J. Alb. Swallow. ix, 160 S. m. 3.

Bormann (Edwin). Der Anekdoten-Schatz Bacon-Shakespeare's. gr. 8. viii, 122 S. m. Abbildgn. u. 3 Taf. L., *E. Bormann's Selbstverl.* Kart., m. 10; geb., m. 12.

Brandes (Geo.) William Shakespeare. In ca. 10 Lfgn. 1. Lfg. gr. 8. S. 1-80 m. Bildnis des Verf. Paris u. L., *A. Langen.* m. 1.75.

Brynildsen (J.) Deutsch-norwegisches (dänisches) Wörterbuch. 1-3. Hft. gr. 8. S. 1-144. Christiania u. Kopenhagen, *A. Cammermeyer's Verl.* à m. —50.

Bühler (Geo.) Indian Studies. Nr. III. [Aus "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8. Wien, *F. Tempsky in Komm.*—III. On the Origin of the Indian Brahma Alphabet. 91 S. m. 1 Taf. m. 2.

Caesaris (C. Julii) commentarii de bello gallico. Für den Schulgebr. hrsg. u. erklärt v. Karl Hamp. Mit Abbildgn., Plänen u. 1 Karte v. Gallien. gr. 8. viiji, 259 S. Bamberg, *C. C. Buchner Verl.* Kart., m. 2.80.

— — Hrsg. v. Frz. Fügner. Kommentar. gr. 8. vi, 200 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* Kart., m. 1.60; Hilfsheft u. Kommentar in 1 Bd. u. d. T.: Erklärungen, kart., m. 2.40.

Ebeling (Geo.) Aubere, altfranzösisches Fable. Mit Einleitg. u. Anmerkgn. hrsg. gr. 8. vii, 147 S. Halle, *M. Niemeyer.* m. 4.

Euclidis opera omnia. Edd. I. L. Heiberg et H. Menge. Vol. VII. Optica, opticorum recensio Theonis, catoptrica, cum scholiis antiquis. Ed. I. L. Heiberg. 8. lv, 362 S. m. Fig. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 5.

Finck (Frz. Nik.) Ueb. das Verhältnis des baltisch-slavischen Nominalaccents zum Urindogermanischen. gr. 8. vi, 60 S. Marburg, *N. G. Elwert's Verl.* m. 1.80.

Fischer (Herm.) Geographie der schwäbischen Mundart. Mit e. Atlas v. 28 (farb.) Karten (in qu. gr. Fol. m. 5 Bl. Erklärgn., in Mappe). Fol. viii, 90 S. Tübingen, *H. Laupp.* m. 20.

Friedlaender (Ulr.) De Zoilo aliisque Homeri obrectatoribus. Diss. gr. 8. 85 S. Königsberg, *W. Koch.* m. 1.50.

Gehring (Aug.) Index Homericus. Appendix, hymnorum vocabula continens. Lex.-8. iv, 235 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 6.

Goerlitz (Karl). De carmine, quod legitur in Aeschyli Choëph. v. 152-164 (Dindorf), v. 146-156 (Kirchhoff). Progr. gr. 4. 12 S. Gross-Strehlitz, *A. Wilpert.* m. 1.

Gregorius Abulfarag, Barhebraeus genannt. Die Scholien zum Buch der Könige (I u. II). Hrsg. v. A. Morgenstern. gr. 8. vii, 39 S. B., *S. Calvary & Co.* m. 2.

— Scholia in Leviticum ex IV codicibus Horrei mysteriorum edita a Geo. Kerber. Diss. gr. 8. 30 S. Lipsiae. Breslau, *W. Koebner.* m. 1.80.

Grundriss der iranischen Philologie, unter Mitwirkg. v. F. K. Andreas, Chr. Bartholomae, C. H. Ethé, etc., hrsg. v. Wilh. Geiger u. Ernst Kuhn. I. Bd. I. Lfg. gr. 8. S. 1-160. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner Verl.* m. 8.

Guidi (I.) Tables alphabétiques du Kitâb al-Ağâni. Fasc. I. Lex.-8. 360 S. Leiden, *E. J. Brill.* m. 12.

Herodotos. Auswahl f. den Schulgebrauch. Von Heinr. Stein. I. Tl.: Text. gr. 8. v, 208 u. Anmerkgn. 44 S. B., *Weidmann.* Geb. in Leinw. u. geh., m. 2.

Hilprecht (H. V.) Assyriaca. I. Tl. gr. 8. vii, 136 S. m. 3 Taf. Halle, *M. Niemeyer in Komm.* Kart., m. 7.

Hirzel (A.) Der Rigveda u. seine Sprache. Aus e. Vortrag üb. altind. Poesie. gr. 8. 19 S. Aarau, *H. R. Sauerländer & Co.* m. —60.

Holland (Rich.) Herdenvögel in der griechischen Mythologie. Progr. gr. 4. 38 S. L., *J. C. Hinrichs' Sort.* m. 1.20.

Holtzmann (Adf.) Das Mahâbhârata u. seine Theile. 4. (Schluss-)Bd. gr. 8. Kiel, *C. F. Haeseler's Verl.* —4. Das Mahâbhârata im Osten u. Westen. Nebst e. Register zu dem ganzen Werk: Das Mahâbhârata u. seine Theile. v, 245 S. m. 13.80.

Holzner (Eug.) Studien zu Euripides. gr. 8. iv, 123 S. Wien u. Prag, *F. Tempsky.* L., *G. Freytag.* m. 4.

Homer's Odyssee. Für den Schulgebr. in verkürzter Form bearb. u. hrsg. v. Jos. Bach. Text. 8. xxx, 288 S. Münster, *Aschendorff.* Geb. in Leinw., m. 2.

Iwanowski (A. R.) Mandjurica. I. hoch 4. St. Petersburg. L., *Voss'* Sort.—I. Proben der solonischen u. dachurischen Sprache. In russ. Sprache. xiv, 79 S. m. 2.40.

Jehlitschka (Henry). Türkische Konversations-Grammatik. gr. 8. viii, 420 S. Heidelberg, *J. Groos.* m. 8.

Kaissling (Frdr.) Ueb. den Gebrauch der Tempora u. Modi in des Aristoteles Politica u. in der Atheniensium Politia. Diss. gr. 8. x, 90 S. Erlangen, Th. Blaesing. m. 2.

Klimek (Paul). Auswahl aus Xenophons Memorabilien. Für den Schulgebr. bearb. u. hrsg. Text. 8. xiii, 78 S. Münster, Aschendorff. Geb. in Leinw., m. —90.

Lüders (Heinr.) Die Vyāsa-Çikshā, besonders in ihrem Verhältnis zum Taittirlyā-Prātiçākhya. gr. 8. 118 S. Kiel, C. F. Haeseler's Verl. m. 5.60.

Lykophron's Alexandra. Griechisch u. deutsch m. erklär. Anmerkgn. von Carl v. Holzinger. gr. 8. 427 S. L., B. G. Teubner. m. 15.

Maass (Ernst). Orpheus. Untersuchungen zur griech., röm., altchristl. Jenseitsdichtg. u. Religion. gr. 8. vii, 334 S. m. 2 Taf. München, C. H. Beck. m. 8.

Meissner (Bruno). Assyrisch-babylonische Chrestomathie f. Anfänger. gr. 4. iv, xxv, 68 S. Leiden, E. J. Brill. m. 12.

Mommssen (Tycho). Beiträge zu der Lehre v. den griechischen Präpositionen. IV (Schluss). gr. 8. x u. S. 289—347. B., Weidmann. m. 14.

Mourek (V. E.) Weitere Beiträge zur Syntax des althochdeutschen Tatian. [Aus "Sitzungsber. d. k. böhm. Gesellsch. d. Wiss."] gr. 8. 51 S. Prag, F. Řivnd ī Komm. m. —80.

Mucke (Ernst). De consonarum in graeca lingua praeter Asiaticorum dialectum aeolicam geminatione. Partic. III. Progr. 4. 30 S. Friburgae. L., G. Fock. m. 1.50.

Ovid's Verwandlungen. Uebers. v. Rob. Zwirnmann. gr. 8. viii, 315 S. Gotha, F. A. Perthes. m. 4.

Pfeiffer (A.) Antike Münzbilder, f. den Schulgebrauch zusammengestellt. gr. 8. viii, 24 S. m. 2 Taf. Winterthur. L., B. G. Teubner. m. 1.60.

Sammlung griechischer u. römischer Klassiker. Ausg. m. erklär. Anmerkgn. I. Bd. gr. 8. L., G. Freytag. Geb.—I. Titi Livi ab urbe condita liber XXVI. Hrsg. v. Ant. Stitz. Mit 2 Abbildgn. u. 5 Karten-skizzen. viii, 89 S. m. 1.

Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialekte. Hrsg. v. Wilh. Braune. I 2. gr. 8. Halle, M. Niemeyer.—I. Gotische Grammatik m. einigen Lesestücken u. Wortverzeichnis v. Wilh. Braune. 4. Aufl. viii, 140 S. m. 2.60.—2. Abriss der angelsächsischen Grammatik v. Ed. Sievers. iii, 56 S. m. 2 Tab. m. 1.50.

Sibawaihi's Buch üb. die Grammatik. Nach der Ausg. v. H. Derenbourg u. dem Commentar des Straßl übersetzt u. erklärt u. m. Auszügen aus Straßl u. anderen Commentaren versehen von G. Jahn. I. Bd. Lex.-8. xi, 388 u. 302 S. B., Reuther & Reichard. Subskr.-Pr., m. 32.

Sorn (Jos.) Ueb. den Gebrauch der Präpositionen bei M. Junianus Justinus. Progr. gr. 8. 30 S. Laibach, I. v. Kleinmayr & F. Bamberg. m. 1.

Thukydides in Auswahl. Hrsg. v. Edm. Lange. Text. gr. 8. iv, 303 S. m. Bildnis u. 3 Karten. L., B. G. Teubner. Kart., m. 2.20.

Torp (Alf.) Zu den phrygischen Inschriften aus römischer Zeit. [Aus "Videnskabsselskabets Skrifter."] gr. 8. 23 S. Kristiania, J. Dybwad in Komm. m. —80.

Untersuchungen, philologische, hrsg. v. A. Kiessling u. U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. 14. Hft. gr. 8. B., Weidmann.—14. Die pneumatische Schule bis auf Archigenes in ihrer Entwickelg. dargestellt v. Max Wellmann. 239 S. m. 7.

Urkunden, ägyptische, aus den königl. Museen zu Berlin. Griechische Urkunden. 2. Bd. 4. Hft. gr. 4. Bl. 97-128. B., Weidmann. m. 2.40.

Winckler (Hugo). Sammlung v. Keilschrifttexten. III. 2. Lfg. gr. 4. L., E. Pfeiffer.—III. Die Keilschrifttexte Assurbanipals. 2. Lfg. Die Bruchstücke des Textes v. Prisma B. S. 41-80. m. 6.

Wulff (J.) Lateinisches Lesebuch. gr. 8. B., Weidmann. Geb., m. 3.

ITALIAN.

Chiappelli (A.) Saggi e note critiche. Bologna. 16mo, p. 324. L. 4.

Giri (I.) De locis qui sunt aut habentur corrupti in Catulli carminibus. Vol. I. Torino. 8vo, p. 289. L. 10.

Vivaldi (V.) Le controversie intorno alla nostra lingua dal 1500 ai nostri giorni. Vol. I-II. Catanzaro. 8vo. L. 8.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- Antoine (Ferdinand). Règles fondamentales de la syntaxe latine, à l'usage des classes. Paris, *E. Bouillon*, 1895.
- Bonnet (Max). Acta Andreae cum Laudatione contexta et Martyrium Andreae (Graece), Passio Andreae (Latine), a se primum edita repetit M. B. Paris, *Klincksieck*, 1895. 2 fr. 50.
- Brugmann (Karl). Zur Geschichte der labiovelaren Verschlusslaute im Griechischen. Sonderabdr. aus den Berichten der königl.-sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften. Sitzung vom 2. Feb. 1895.
- Bureau of Ethnology. Publications. Boaz (Franz): Chinook Texts. Fowke (Gerard): Archeologic Investigations in James and Potomac Valleys. Mooney (Jas.): The Siouan Tribes of the West. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1894.
- Burke's Speech on Conciliation with America, 1775. With introduction and notes. Boston, *D. C. Heath & Co.*, 1895. 20 cts.
- Carroll (Mitchell). Aristotle's Poetics, C. XXV in the Light of the Homeric Scholia. (J. H. U. Thesis.) Baltimore, *J. Murphy & Co.*, 1895.
- Cauer (Paul). Grundfragen der Homerkritik. Leipzig, *S. Hirzel*, 1895.
- Cicero. Cato Maior. De Senectute. Ed. with introduction and notes by Frank Ernest Rockwood. New York, Cinc., Chic., 1895. 90 cts.
- De Oratore. Lib. I. Ed. on the basis of Sorof's second ed. by W. B. Owen. Boston, New York and Chic., *Leach, Shewell & Sanborn*, 1895.
- Ciceronis (M. T.) pro T. Annio Milone oratio. Ed. for schools and colleges by J. S. Reid. Cambridge, *At the University Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1894.
- Cook (A. S.) Exercises in Old English. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1895. 40 cts.
- Cooper (F. T.) Word-Formation in the Roman Sermo Plebeius. (Diss. Columb. College.) New York, 1895.
- Dictionnaire général de la langue française, du commencement du XVII^e siècle jusqu'à nos jours, par MM. Hatzfeld, A. Darmesteter et Ant. Thomas. Paris, *Librairie Delagrave*, 1895. xve livr. à 1 fr. 15 c.; œuvre compl., 30 fr.
- Dieckhoff (Otto). De Ciceronis libris De Natura Deorum recensendis. Gottingae, *Vandenhoeck et Ruprecht*, 1895. 1 m. 40 pf.
- Eclectic English Classics. History of the Plague in London, by Daniel Defoe. 40 cts.
- Orations on Bunker Hill Monument, The Character of Washington and The Landing at Plymouth, by Daniel Webster. 20 cts. New York, Cinc., Chic., *American Book Co.*, 1895.

Educational Review. Ed. by N. M. Butler. May, June, 1895. New York, *H. Holt & Co.* \$3 per annum.

English Dictionary (A New) on Historical Principles. Ed. by J. A. H. Murray. FANGED-FEE (vol. IV), by Henry Bradley. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press.* New York, *Macmillan & Co.* Baltimore, *Cushing & Co.,* 1895. 60 cts.

Erasmi Convivia e conloquiis familiaribus selecta. Ed. with notes and vocabulary by Victor S. Clark. Boston, *Ginn & Co.,* 1895.

Foucart (P.) Recherches sur l'origine et la nature des mystères d'Éleusis. Extrait des Mémoires de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres. Tome XXXV. 2e Partie. Paris, *C. Klincksieck,* 1895. 3 fr. 50.

Genth (Bernhard). Griechische Schulgrammatik. 4te Aufl. Leipzig, *G. Freytag.* Geb., 2 m. 20 pf.

Gilbert (Gustav). The Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens. Tr. by E. J. Brooks and T. Nicklin. With an introductory note by J. E. Sandys. London, *Swan Sonnenschein.* New York, *Macmillan & Co.* Baltimore, *Cushing & Co.,* 1895. \$3.

Greek Prose Composition. By Francis G. Allinson. Third ed., revised and enlarged. Boston, *Allyn & Bacon,* 1895.

Hall (Fitzedward). Two Trifles: I. A Rejoinder. II. Scientist with a Preamble. Printed for the author.

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology. Vol. V. Boston, *Ginn & Co.,* 1895. \$2.

Hippokrates. Sämmliche Werke. Ins Deutsche übersetzt u. ausführlich commentirt von Robert Fuchs. Erster Band. München, *Lüneburg,* 1895. 10 m. 20 pf.

Holmes (D. H.) Die mit Präpositionen zusammengesetzten Verben bei Thukydides. (J. H. U. Diss.) Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung,* 1895.

Homer's Odyssey. Book VI. Ed. for the use of schools by C. W. Bain. (School Classics.) Boston, *Ginn & Co.,* 1895. 45 cts.

Jones (H. Stuart). Select Passages from Ancient Writers illustrative of the History of Greek Sculpture. With translation and notes. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.* Baltimore, *Cushing & Co.,* 1895. \$2.25.

Livi (Titi) ab urbe condita. Liber XXVI. Herausg. von Anton Stitz. Mit 2 Abbildungen u. 5 Kartenskizzen. Leipzig, *G. Freytag,* 1895. 1 m.

Modern Language Association of America, Publications of. Vol. X, No. 2. Contents: IV. Frederick Tupper: Anglo-Saxon Daeg-Mael.—V. O. F. Emerson: Parallel between the M. E. Poem *Patience* and an Early Latin Poem Attributed to Tertullian.—VI. Mary Augusta Scott: Elizabethan Translations from the Italian. Baltimore, *The Association,* 1895. \$1.

Old South Leaflets. No. 8. The Monroe Doctrine. Boston, *Directors of the Old South Work,* 1895.

Philo. About the Contemplative Life, or the Fourth Book of the Treatise concerning Virtue. Critically edited, with a defence of its genuineness, by F. C. Conybear. With a facsimile. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press.* New York, *Macmillan & Co.* Baltimore, *Cushing & Co.,* 1895.

Platner (Samuel Ball). Bibliography of the Younger Pliny. (Western Reserve University Bulletin, April, 1895.)

Plauti Trinummus. Tr. into English by H. O. Sibley and Frank Smalley. Syracuse, *Mason & Co.*, 1895.

Prudentius: a Syntactic, Stylistic and Metrical Study. By Emory Blair Lease. (J. H. U. Diss.) Baltimore, 1895.

Racine's Athalia. Edited with an introduction, containing a treatise on versification, and with notes by Charles A. Eggert. Boston, *D. C. Heath*, 1895.

Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften. Herausg. v. H. Collitz u. F. Bechtel. III. Bd. IV. Heft. 2. Hälfte. Die Inschriften von Kalymna u. Kos, bearbeitet von P. Müllensiefen u. F. Bechtel. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht*, 1895. 3 m. 20 pf.

Schwatt (I. J.) A Geometrical Treatment of Curves which are isogonal conjugate to a straight line with respect to a triangle. In two parts. Part I. Boston, New York and Chic., *Leach, Shewell & Sanborn*, 1895.

Sedlmayer (H. St.) u. Scheindler (Aug.) Lateinisches Uebungsbuch für die oberen Classen der Gymnasien. Wien u. Prag, *F. Tempsky*, 1895. Geb., 1 fl. 50 kr.

Seidel (Heinrich). Der Lindenbaum. Ed. for school use by Ernst Richard.—Die Monate. Ed. for school use by R. Arrowsmith. New York, Cinc. and Chic., *American Book Co.*, 1895. @ 25 cts.

Sound Currency. Reform Club, 52 William street. (Semi-monthly.) 1895. @ 5 cts.

Steiner (Josef) u. Scheindler (Aug.) Lateinisches Lese- u. Uebungsbuch. Im Anschluss an Scheindlers Lateinische Schulgrammatik. Zweiter Theil. 2te, umgearb. Aufl. Wien u. Prag, *F. Tempsky*, 1895.

Stifter (Adalbert). Das Heidendorf. Ed. for school use by Max Lentz. New York, Cinc. and Chic., *American Book Co.*, 1895. 25 cts.

Tolman (Albert H.) The Expressive Power of English Sounds. (Reprinted from *The Atlantic Monthly*, April, 1895.)

Verrall (A. W.) Euripides, the Rationalist: a Study in the History of Art and Religion. Cambridge, *At the University Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.* Baltimore, *Cushing & Co.*, 1895. \$1.90.

Warr (G. C. W.) The Dawn of European Literature. The Greek Epic. London, *S. P. C. K.*, 1895.

Webster's First Bunker Hill Oration, 1825. With preface, introduction and notes by A. J. George. Boston, *D. C. Heath & Co.*, 1894. 20 cts.